DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 047 CG 006 138

AUTHOR	Greene, Elaine
TITLE	Counselor Verbal Behavior as a Function of Client Demeanor. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-B-024
PUB DATE	Jun 70
GRANT	OEG-2-9-420024-1019(010)
NOTE	111p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Elaine Greene, 32 Sanford Street, Rochester, New York 14620
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns, Counselor Characteristics, *Counselor Performance, Empathy, *Interpersonal Relationship, *Interviews, Psychological Characteristics, *Response Mode, *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to study the verbal behavior of counselors emitted in response to different emotional dispositions of clients. Aggressive amd submissive client "stimuli" were the focus of study. Two members of a college drama group, trained in the role of a submissive and an aggressive client, respectively, were interviewed by 31 counselors, who had been requested to conduct intake or "disposition" interviews with these "students on the college counseling center waiting list." The half-hour tape-recorded interviews were analyzed for counselors' verbal behavior using a revision of Bales' (1950) Interaction Process Analysis system, developed by Gamsky (1965). Analysis of the data indicated that counselors do emit significantly different verbal bahavior, as well as to such behavior aimed at themselves rather than toward others. Submissive individuals elicit "comforting" reactions and reflections of their feelings significantly more than do aggressive individuals. The latter tend to evoke more passivity, more avoidance, and more active interpretive responses from counselors. Discussion of the results of the study included some suggestions concerning the implications of these findings, as well as ideas for further research. (Author)

BR 9-B-024

Approved
12/29/70

Dr. John Sokol
Director, Educational Research
DHEW-OFFICE OF EDUCATION - RM 1013
Federal Building
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007

ED 046047

FINAL REPORT

CG

Project No. 9-B-024

Grant No. OEG-2-9-420024-1019(010)

COUNSELOR VERBAL BEHAVIOR AS A FUNCTION OF CLIENT DEMEANOR

Elaine Greene

32 Sanford Street
Rochester, New York
14620

June, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 006 138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ED 046047

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-B-024

Grant No. OEG-2-9-420024-1019(010)

COUNSELOR VERBAL BEHAVIOR AS A FUNCTION OF CLIENT DEMEANOR

Elaine Greene

32 Sanford Street
Rochester, New York
14620

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent office Office of Education position or policy.

June, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Martin J. Bohn, Jr., sponsor of this research project, and Dr. Albert S. Thompson, committee member and chairman of the Psychology department, provided many helpful suggestions which were incorporated into the final report. Dr. Rosedith Sitgreaves gave assistance concerning plans for statistical analysis from the very early stages of the research work. Through the invitation of Dr. Roger A. Myers, tape-recorded data from some of his previous work and that of Kenneth Heller were made available to this investigator. Chiogu Ebede generously gave her time, personal interest and knowledge to work on computer programming for this study.

Many friends and colleagues contributed help and support of various kinds at different stages of this research project. I am grateful to Steven Estrine, Helena Harris, Rosalyn Baumrind, Libby V. Chaet, Susan Fraiden, Dr. and Mrs. Harry Greene, Mary Ebi, Gustave Manasse, Matt Lanna, Margaret Wickstrom, Eulalia Fagan, Judith Steiber, Adrianne Eckberg, Ruth Bender, Ruth Shereff, Frances Nesmith, Kathy and Robert Phalen, H. Daniel Noble, and many others.

I would like to express my love and appreciation to Allan J. Schwartz, who provided assistance and concern from the beginning to the present.

E.G.

This thesis is affectionately dedicated to some special friends in Teachers College:

Mr. Julius Armstrong
Miss Zehora Bar-Droma
Mr. Wavery Canody
Miss Michelle Everett
Mr. Charles Glassford
Mr. Harry Gordon
Dr. Maxine Greene
Mrs. Nan Heaney
Mr. Richard Hines
Mr. Wilbur Jackson
Mr. William Jones
Mr. Jackson Kytle
Mrs. Julia McClure
Miss Winsome Munro
Mr. John Vanden Brink

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements ii

List of Tables viii

Chapter

I--BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1

Review of Literature 1

Purpose of the Present Study 8

Hypotheses of the Present Study 11

Hypothesis I 11

Hypothesis II 12

II---DESIGN AND PROCEDURES 13

Design of the Study 13

Variables 13

Procedures of Data Collection 14

Content Analysis Measures 15

Preliminary Research 15

Development of Content Analysis Categories for the Present Study 18

Classification of Counselor Responses . . 18

Scoring of Counselor Responses 22

Classification of Client Submissive and Aggressive Responses and Objects of Client Responses 23

Classification of Submissive and Aggressive Client Responses 23

Classification of Objects of Client Responses 23

Scoring of Counselor Responses to Client Emotional Behavior directed at Object Persons 25

Treatment of the Recorded Interviews 26

Typescripts 26

Segmentation 26

Rating Sheets 27

Statistical Procedures 27

Reliability Test Procedures 29

III--ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 33

Reliability Test of Counselor Response Ratings 33

Combination of Counselor Response Categories . . 33

Rationale for Combining Categories 35

Method and Results of Reliability Test of Counselor Response Ratings 37

Test of Hypothesis I 40

Reliability Test for Client Response Ratings 42

Test of Hypothesis II 46

Determination of Subsamples for Analysis of Hypothesis II 46

Low Frequency of Client Aggressive and Submissive Responses 46

Cases with Minimal Number of Relevant Responses 49

Method and Results of Test for Hypothesis II . . 50

Further Analysis of the Counselor Response Data . . . 53

IV--INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS 56

Page

Relationship between Present Study and Previous Research 56

Results of Hypothesis I 56

Counselor Responses to Submissive vs. Aggressive Clients 56

Relationship of Hypothesis I Findings to Previous Research 56

Results of Hypothesis II 61

Counselor Responses to Submissive Client Remarks focused on the Counselor vs. Others 61

Relationship of Hypothesis II (Submissive Client) Data to Previous Research 61

Counselor Responses to Aggressive Client Remarks focused on the Counselor vs. Others 61

Relationship of Hypothesis II (Aggressive Client) Data to Previous Research 62

Implications of Results of the Present Study 64

Theoretical Implications 64

Practical Implications 66

Counselor Behavior and Counseling Practice . 66

Counselor Training 69

Limitations of the Present Study 72

Suggestions for Further Research 73

V--SUMMARY OF THE PRESENT STUDY 78

REFERENCES 81

Appendix A Bales Interaction Process Analysis Categories 85

Appendix B Gamsky's "Rating Form for Counselor Behavior Categories" 86

Page

Appendix C Scoring Manual of Present Study 92

Appendix D Comparison of Bales, Gamsky and Greene Counselor Behavior Categories 100

Appendix E Sample Rating Sheet and Coding Symbols . 101

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Categories of Counselor Verbal Behavior	19
2	Frequency of Twenty-One Kinds of Counselor Responses in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client-Actor	34
3	Combined Categories of the Content Analysis System of Counselor Verbal Behavior	36
4	Percent of Agreement between Ratings by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge of Counselor Responses in Twelve Interviews	38
5	Analysis of Variance: Effects of Time Period and Client Type upon Reliability Test Results	39
6	Frequency of Different Counselor Responses in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client-Actor	41
7	Percent of Agreement between Ratings by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge of Client Responses in Twelve Interviews	43
8	Percent of Agreement between Ratings by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge of Objects of Submissive and Aggressive Client Responses in Twelve Interviews	45
9	Percent of Agreement between Ratings by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge of Object of Client Response, when there is Inter-rater Agreement on the Client Response	47
10	Mean Frequencies of Submissive or Aggressive Client Responses, per Interview	48
11	Number of Interviews with Three or More Counselor Responses to Submissive or Aggressive Client Behavior	50
12	Frequency of Different Counselor Responses to Client Submissiveness and Aggressiveness Directed at the Counselor vs. Other Persons	52

Page

13 Ranked Mean Frequency per Interview of Different Counselor Responses in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client 54

14 Comparison of Significant Findings in Two Studies of Counselor Verbal Responses to Clients 58

15 Avoidance Behaviors Emitted by Counselors in the Present Study 60

16 Comparison of Counselor Responses to Aggressiveness/ Hostility Directed at Different Object Persons . . . 62

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this investigation was to study the verbal behavior of counselors emitted in response to different emotional dispostions of clients. Aggressive and submissive client "stimuli" were the focus of study. Both aggressiveness and submissiveness are major issues in adolescent development and are frequently encountered in the work relationships of counselors with college student counselees.

Review of Literature

A number of researchers have posited an "elicitation model" of client-counselor interaction. The basic idea of such a model is that each participant tends to evoke particular kinds of behaviors from the other, and that the behavior of each is thus a function, not only of his own personality, but also of the characteristics and behavior of the "other participant."

Various theoretical conceptions have been employed in studies presenting this general model of interaction. The

work of Kopplin (1965)[1] and several others has been based upon social learning or reinforcement theory. The concept of "interpersonal response pull" underlies the work of Leary (1957)[2] and Heller, Myers and Kline (1963)[3]. Moos and Clemes (1967)[4] suggest that the patient-therapist interaction constitutes a "system" in which there are mutual, changing, elicitation effects.

The methods employed in studies of such dyadic interactions have been varied, and have included counseling analogue and actual counseling sessions, experimental and content analysis designs. (Pool, 1959;[5] Auld and White, 1959;[6]

---

1 David A. Kopplin, Eliciting responses in client-therapist interaction: A content analysis of initial psychotherapeutic interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

2 Timothy Leary, Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.

3 Kenneth Heller, Roger A. Myers, and Linda V. Kline, Interviewer behavior as a function of standardized client roles. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

4 Rudolf H. Moos and Stanley R. Clemes, Multivariate study of the patient-therapist system. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31 (2), 119-130.

5 Ithiel de Sola Pool, Trends in content analysis today: A summary. In Ithiel de Sola Pool (Ed.), Trends in content analysis. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1959. Chapter 7.

6 Frank Auld, Jr. and Alice Marsden White, Sequential dependencies in psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 100-104.

Bandura, Lipsher, and Miller (1960);[1] Frank and Sweetland (1962);[2] Berzins and Seidman, (1969).[3]

Of particular relevance here, are studies of the eliciting effects of dependent and aggressive behavior from clients. Heller, Myers and Kline (1963)[4] found that counselors responded to submissive clients with significantly more "dominance" than characterized their behavior with "dominant" clients. Warkentin and Leland,[5] in one of a series of tape-recorded presentations by practicing psychotherapists, suggest that the therapist working with an "oral-dependent" patient responds in a "parental" manner to "the helpless baby sitting in front of him." In two studies

---

[1] Albert Bandura, Donald H. Lipsher, and Paula B. Miller, Psychotherapists' approach-avoidance reactions to patients' expressions of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[2] George H. Frank and Anders Sweetland, A study of the process of psychotherapy: The verbal interaction. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 135-138.

[3] Juris I. Berzins and Edward Seidman, Differential therapeutic responding of A and B quasi-therapists to schizoid and neurotic communications. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 279-286.

[4] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

[5] John Warkentin and Tom Leland, Human character traits. American Academy of Psychotherapists Tape Library, Volume #4.

(1965, 1967)[1,2] Bohn reported that a dependent client evoked more directive verbal responses than did a "typical" or a "hostile" client. Dependent emotional demeanor in female clients tends to evoke a sense of failure or of "not feeling good" in female therapists, according to a study by Howard, Orlinsky, and Hill (1969).[3] These researchers were investigating self-reported feelings of therapists concerning their interaction with their patients.

Russell (1961)[4] and Russell and Snyder (1963)[5] suggested that hostile client behavior produces more anxiety in therapists than does friendly client behavior. Counselors are more likely to respond in a hostile way to a hostile client than to a friendly or nonhostile client, according to the

---

[1] Martin J. Bohn, Jr., Counselor behavior as a function of counselor dominance, counselor experience, and client type. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12 (4), 346-352.

[2] Martin J. Bohn, Jr., Therapist responses to hostility and dependency as a function of training. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31 (2), 195-198.

[3] Kenneth I. Howard, David E. Orlinsky, and James A. Hill, The therapist's feelings in the therapeutic process. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25 (1), 83-93.

[4] Peter D. Russell, Counselor anxiety in relation to clinical experience and hostile or friendly clients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961.

[5] Peter D. Russell and William U. Snyder, Counselor anxiety in relation to amount of clinical experience and quality of affect demonstrated by clients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 22, 358-363.

work of Heller, Myers and Kline (1963).[1]

Carson, Harden and Shows (1964)[2] found evidence of an interactional function of "quasi-therapists'" A-B typing based on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank test items comprising the A-B Scale and, on the other hand, certain patient characteristics. The latter included different styles of handling stress and anger. Subjects with a high A-type score tended to respond with greater "depth-directedness," i.e., depth-oriented interpretation, to patient "stimuli" which were extrapunitive. There were no significant "main effects;" that is, differences between therapists became evident only when the intra- or extrapunitive tendencies of the "other person" were considered.

Berzins and Seidman (1968)[3] found that subjects with high A ratings on the A-B type scale experienced greater subjective satisfaction concerning their responses to a "schizoid" patient tape-recorded presentation, in which the latter patient tended to turn anger outward, while subjects with high B ratings felt more satisfaction responding to a neurotic intrapunitive patient.

---

[1] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

[2] Robert C. Carson, Judith A. Harden, and W. Derek Shows, A-B distinction and behavior in quasi-therapeutic situations. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 426-433.

[3] Juris I. Berzins and Edward Seidman, Subjective reactions of A and B quasi-therapists to schizoid and neurotic communications: A replication and extension. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 342-347.

In a subsequent study, Berzins and Seidman (1969)[1] found that "when A's were paired with the schizoid patient, and B's with the neurotic patient, their "helpful" responses were significantly longer, more declarative (as versus questioning), more emotionally positive, and were regarded as "more satisfying and helpful by S's themselves than were the responses of A's and B's who were oppositely paired."

In a more recent project, Berzins, Seidman and Welch (1970)[2] tested what they call a "complementarity hypothesis" concerning the interaction of individuals with A and B "typing" with patients who have different characteristic styles of handling anger, as well as different "diagnoses." While only B subjects behaved differently with the intra- vs. the extrapunitive patient "stimuli," both A's and B's felt more satisfaction with the complementary patient types.

The focus or object of a client's aggressiveness or submissiveness has been studied to some extent. Bandura, Lipsher and Miller (1960)[3] found that the direction of a client's hostility aroused different reactions in counselors. Hostility toward the therapist did not elicit as many "approach"

---

[1] Berzins and Seidman, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 279-286. (Page 27)

[2] Juris I. Berzins, Edward Seidman, and Robert D. Welch, A-B therapist "types" and responses to patient-communicated hostility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34 (1), 27-32.

[3] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

responses as did hostility aimed at someone else. This reaction is particularly significant because several studies have indicated that therapists' approach and avoidance responses are related to subsequent responses on the part of the client.

Gamsky and Farwell (1966)[1] explored counselors' responses to hostile clients in an experimental counseling analogue study. Their findings support those of Heller, Myers and Kline; counselors interviewing hostile clients expressed disapproval and antagonism, especially when hostility is directed at themselves. Results of the Gamsky and Farwell research also agreed with those reported by Bandura, Lipsher, and Miller; counselors avoided hostility focused on themselves more than hostility directed at others.

These researchers also found a significant increase in the use of reassurance, suggestions and information-giving in counselors' verbal behavior when faced with hostility directed at themselves. This may suggest a relationship between some "acceptable" directive counselor reactions to difficult client behavior and, on the other hand, the less generally acceptable use of "avoidance" and hostility.

---

[1] Neal R. Gamsky and Gail F. Farwell, Counselor verbal behavior as a function of client hostility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 184-190.

Winder, Ahmad, Bandura and Rau (1962)[1] and Schuldt (1966)[2] reported that counselors "approach" client dependency directed at the counselor more frequently than dependency related to other persons. Snyder (1963),[3] in a book of case studies of therapy with dependent clients, stated that the therapist used supportive techniques at a higher rate than usual when the client's dependency was directed at him, and at a lower rate than usual when the client's dependency was focused on other individuals.

The most general findings thus far seem to be that submissive clients tend to elicit "dominant" and "directive" behaviors from counselors, and that hostile or aggressive clients seem to arouse hostility and, less conclusively, anxiety, in people interacting with them. Further, counselors tend to respond more positively and actively to dependency directed at themselves than at others, while they tend to avoid hostility focused upon themselves more than hostility toward others.

Purpose of the Present Study

The present investigation explored the effects of two

---

[1] C. L. Winder, Farrukh Z. Ahmad, Albert Bandura, and Lucy C. Rau, Dependency of patients, psychotherapists' responses, and aspects of psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

[2] W. John Schuldt, Psychotherapists" approach-avoidance responses and clients' expression of dependency. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13 (2), 178-183.

[3] William U. Snyder, Dependency in psychotherapy. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

client variables upon counselor verbal behavior. Different kinds of client emotional disposition, aggressiveness and submissiveness, constitute the variable of "client demeanor" or "client types." The focus of the client's aggressiveness or submissiveness, either the counselor or other people as objects of his emotional expression, was the secondary topic of study.

By this time, a small body of research has been built up concerning these variables, as has been illustrated. In the development of any scientific field, various investigations must be linked with one another in order to confirm and enlarge the information each is able to offer. As the body of findings in this area develops, theoretical implications about interpersonal processes between counselors and student-clients, and practical implications for training counselors and for optimal student-counselor interaction should become more clear.

The basic design of this study, a counseling analogue in which a sample of counselors interviewed the same client-actors portraying standardized roles, most closely resembles the studies of Heller, Myers and Kline (1963)[1] and Gamsky and Farwell (1966).[2]

Like Gamsky's work, this study explored the effects of

---

[1] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

[2] Gamsky and Farwell, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 184-190.

counselor- vs. other-directed client hostility upon counselor verbal responses. The measure of counselor behavior employed is substantially the same as that of Gamsky and Farwell. Thus, this research is a partial replication of their work, and its findings can possibly provide a comparison.

On the other hand, this study differs in two ways which may provide significant contrasts or additions to Gamsky and Farwell's study. In the design of these researchers, client-actors were instructed to focus hostile expression on parents and others for one period of the interview, and then in a subsequent period to focus hostility on the counselor. Thus counselor response was studied for two separate and global segments of the interview. The design of the present study was based on having the aggressive client-actor focus negative attitudes on the counselor as well as others throughout the interview. This study therefore analyzed counselor responses directed at variably-distributed and specific client statements aimed at the counselor or toward other persons.

A second contrast with Gamsky and Farwell was the addition in this study of a submissive client-type seen by the same counselor sample. Thus the mode of analyzing counselor verbal behavior which was applied by the previous researchers to client hostility and friendliness was here used to study reactions to client dependency as well.

The interview data of this study were originally collected for the study by Heller, Myers and Kline (1963).[1] This investigation has dealt with basically the same question of effects of standardized client roles (dominant-hostile, i.e., "aggressive," and dependent-friendly, i.e., "submissive") upon counselor behavior. Heller, Myers and Kline used a rating system based upon Leary's (1957)[2] Interpersonal Checklist to evaluate counselor behavior by observation of the ongoing interviews. Their results were in terms of global "dominant and submissive," "hostile and friendly" tendencies evoked in counselors.

This study links the Heller, Myers and Kline findings with those of other researchers by studying counselor responses in terms of a more specific repertoire of verbal behaviors.

Hypotheses of the Present Study

There were two basic hypotheses in this investigation, stated as follows in the form of null hypotheses:

Hypothesis I

There is no difference in counselor verbal behavior in interaction with aggressive vs. submissive interviewees.

---

[1] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

[2] Leary, Interpersonal diagnosis of personality.

Hypothesis II

There is no difference in counselor verbal behavior in response to aggressive or submissive interviewee statements focused upon the counselor vs. such statements focused upon others.

CHAPTER II

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Design of the Study

Variables

The counselors' interview encounters with each of two "client'types," aggressive and submissive, constituted the two conditions of the main independent variable, "client emotional disposition."

The second independent variable was object of client response. Client aggressive remarks and client submissive remarks which were directed specifically at the counselor or specifically at other individuals were identified and analyzed for their effect upon the counselors' verbal behavior.

The dependent variable, counselor response, was measured by an interview content analysis. A revision of Bales' System of Interaction Process Analysis (1950)[1] was the main source used in developing the system of categories. A description of the development and content of the version used in this study will be presented later in this chapter.

The basic design of the research involved a counseling analogue in which actors, in the roles of an aggressive and a submissive client, respectively, were seen in half-hour

---

[1] Robert F. Bales, Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.

interviews by thirty-one counselors, who served as subjects in this project. Each session was tape-recorded and subsequently analyzed to describe the counselors' behavior.

Procedures of Data Collection

The "clients" in this study were members of a university drama group, who were trained to play the roles of an aggressive (dominant and hostile) and a submissive (dependent and nonhostile) client, respectively. The aggressive client's interview behavior was generally assertive, critical and sarcastic. The submissive client role was characterized by docility, a desire to depend upon others, timidity, anxiety, and agreeableness. Judges' ratings of the demeanor of the interviewees in tape-recorded interactions indicated that the actors' portrayals were consistent with their assigned roles. (Heller, Myers and Kline, 1963)[1]

The counselors, in training at a university counseling center, were asked to participate in a study dealing with the appropriateness of certain time limits for initial interviews. They were requested to use their own preferred approaches in helping the clients with their problems during the half-hour and to make recommendations for subsequent disposition of the case. Thus, the counselors understood the clients to be real, and also believed they could be of help to them. The design of the study counterbalanced the order in which individual

---

[1] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

counselors saw each type of client.

Content Analysis Measures

Preliminary Research

As part of the pilot work in preparation for this study, literature concerning content analysis of counseling behavior was explored. Although there are many different lists of categories representing types of counselor verbal behavior, three major types of content analysis systems for studying client-therapist interaction seemed of particular interest in relation to the present research. These may be labeled "Directive-nondirective," "Approach-avoidance," and "Role-behavior" systems.

Directive-nondirective is a central dimension related originally to the work of Carl Rogers (1942, 1951)[1,2] and incorporated into research measures first by Porter (1943)[3] and Snyder (1945).[4]

Directive behaviors by a counselor are active efforts to

---

[1] Carl R. Rogers, Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942.

[2] Carl R. Rogers, Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

[3] Elias H. Porter, Jr., The development and evaluation of a measure of counseling interview procedures. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1943, 3, 105-126.

[4] William U. Snyder, An investigation of the nature of nondirective psychotherapy. Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 193-223.

influence what another person says or does, while "non-directive" behaviors are acknowledging and facilitative, without purposefully determining the nature of a client's behavior. Since the early work on client-centered therapy and theory, more recent research has suggested that even supposedly nondirective counseling behavior has specifiable determinative effects upon client responses. Also, since the work of Rogers began, there is less of a tendency to simplistically value nondirectiveness positively and directive behaviors negatively.

Although this construct is more complicated than had been indicated in earlier work, the directive-nondirective dimension is still considered a meaningful one for describing interpersonal behavior.

The use of the "approach-avoidance" dimension in therapeutic activity is derived from neo-behavioristic learning theories beginning with the work of Dollard and Miller (1950).[1] Bandura et al. (1960)[2] and Winder et al. (1962)[3] have developed content analysis systems in which this is the primary factor in describing therapists' behavior.

---

[1] John Dollard and Neal E. Miller, Personality and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

[2] Bandura, Lipsher, and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24,1-8.

[3] Winder, Ahmad, Bandura, and Rau, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

"Approach" responses are verbalizations intended to elicit further expression or elaboration of the other person's immediately preceding responses. "Avoidance" behaviors are those intended to inhibit, discourage or divert further expression of the kind of response in the previous statements of the other person. (Kopplin, 1966).[1]

Basically, avoidance responses are non-acknowledging or negatively evaluative, while approach responses acknowledge or actually express positive evaluation of the other person's preceding response.

The third major type of content analysis system which has been used in studies of counselor verbal responses is that involving "role behaviors." According to Tomczyk (1965),[2] whose dissertation was in the tradition of Danskin (1955)[3] and Hoffman (1959),[4] "a counselor verbal role refers to a type, or a consistent pattern, of verbal behavior that a counselor may use in counseling." Bales' Interaction Process Analysis system (1950)[5] is a major and early example of this third kind of content analysis approach.

---

[1] Kopplin, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

[2] John R. Tomczyk, Client perceptions of counselor verbal roles as related to diagnostic categories. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965.

[3] David G. Danskin, Roles played by counselors in their interviews. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 22-27.

[4] A. E. Hoffman, An analysis of counselor sub-roles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 61-67.

[5] Bales, Interaction process analysis.

The content analysis categories which were used in this study were drawn mainly from the revision of the Bales IPA system which was developed by Gamsky (1965).[1] This choice was made for two reasons: (1) Gamsky's research was very similar in content and design to the present investigation; use of a similar content analysis procedure would facilitate comparison of results; and (2) the Bales-Gamsky categories seem to incorporate both the directive-nondirective and approach-avoidance dimensions, in addition to providing labels for most of the kinds of counseling interaction behaviors which have been included in the other category systems.

Development of Content Analysis Categories for the Present Study

Classification of Counselor Responses. The investigator decided to make the original set of counselor response categories for this study relatively numerous and detailed, in order to permit as much as possible of the variety of counselor behavior identified by previous researchers to become evident. It was expected that where frequencies of particular kinds of responses turned out to be low, categories could be combined for analysis.

This rationale underlay alterations of the Gamsky-Bales list of counselor responses. Some of the original twenty-one variables used in this study were formed by subdividing

---

[1] Neal Richard Gamsky, The effect of client demeanor and focus of hostility upon the responses of school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Gamsky's categories on the basis of other content analysis and theoretical systems.

The lists of Bales' original categories and of Gamsky's revised set are presented in Appendices A and B.

The following table presents the original twenty-one categories of counselor behavior used in this study:

Table 1

Categories of Counselor Verbal Behavior

1. Reassurance	11. Request for elaboration
2. Approval	12. Reflection
3. Tension release	13. Nondirective lead
4. Suggestion	14. Simple Acceptance
5. Persuasion	15. Silence
6. Structuring	16. Expression of tension
7. Opinion	17. Mislabeling;misunderstanding
8. Information	18. Avoidance
9. Interpretation	19. Disagreement;disapproval
10. Request for information	20. Antagonism
	21. Unclassifiable

The manual of definitions and examples of these counselor response categories may be found in Appendix C. A table in which categories of the Bales, Gamsky and present study content analysis systems are juxtaposed so that they may be compared is presented in Appendix D.

The ways in which these categories represent alterations of the Gamsky system are as follows:

(a) Gamsky's category, "Gives suggestions" was, for the purposes of this study, divided into three aspects: "Suggestions" given by the counselor, plus "Structuring" of the interview and "Persuasion." Gamsky's definition of "Gives suggestions" specifically includes responses which "structure the interview." It seemed to this researcher worthwhile to distinguish this kind of counselor behavior from other responses which propose courses of action. Thus, "Structuring" was designated a separate category. Likewise, persuasive behavior is included within the "Gives suggestions" description in Gamsky's list; it seemed of possible value to distinguish different intensities of advisement, and such distinctions have been made by other researchers (e.g., Steiber, 1967).[1]

(b) There happened to be no category in the Gamsky list which explicitly and centrally labeled expression by the counselor of his own views, apart from interpretations of client behavior or from information-giving. Gamsky's "Reflects" category includes this as well as restatements or clarifications of client remarks by the counselor. It seemed appropriate to make a distinction between these kinds of verbal behavior, so a separate category entited "Opinion" ("Gives opinion") was designated.

---

[1] Judith K. Steiber, Counselor anxiety and interview behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

(c) Nondirective lead, a kind of counselor behavior commonly used in content analyses emphasizing the directiveness-nondirectiveness continuum, is closely related to "Asks for elaboration," one of Gamsky's categories. The latter includes both "open-ended questions and general leads; questions designed to encourage the client to explain further" and "requests for elaboration of how the client feels." For purposes of exploration, this rather subtle difference in degree of counselor activity was the basis for separating the two categories. Thus, in the present study, "Nondirective lead" is defined as "unpressuring open-ended general 'lead' questions to encourage the client to explain further or delve more deeply in to the feelings he or she had just expressed," while "Request for Elaboration" is defined in a way that involves more active or direct requests.

(d) The label "Simple Acceptance" was used instead of Gamsky's term, "Agrees, Understands," since the definition of the latter category is the same as one contained in the content analysis systems emphasizing the directive-nondirective dimension (e.g., Snyder, 1945).[1] This change was made in order to establish the connection with those systems measuring this lead-taking continuum.

(e) Included within Gamsky's "Avoids, Shows tension"

---

[1] Snyder, Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 193-223.

category is "long silence." Silence usually appears as a separate category in approach-avoidance content analysis research, and it seemed of possible value to include it as such in this study. To make the ratings in this investigation, "Silence" responses were defined as silence lasting at least ten seconds. This decision was based on information from research by Auld and White (1956),[1] who found that an average sentence could be considered equivalent to five seconds.

(f) In defining his category, "Avoids, shows tension," Gamsky actually makes a clear separation between the two aspects of the label. It seemed potentially worthwhile to emphasize both kinds of behavior by presenting them as separate categories. The category "Avoids" includes behaviors labeled "Avoidance reactions" in other content analysis systems based upon the approach-avoidance dimension.

(g) Gamsky's list combined "Disagrees" and "Misunderstands." These were designated separated categories in the present study.

Scoring of Counselor Responses. The contextual unit in this content analysis was the total verbalization of the counselor plus the preceding client response. The scoring unit was the sentence. The purpose of designating this unit of classification was to permit weighting related to length or repetitiveness of counselor verbal behavior. The total

---

[1] Frank Auld and Alice M. White, Rules for subdividing interviews into sentences. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 42, 273-281.

number of sentence units scored in each interview was designated as the variable, "Number of sentence units." In addition, the number of total verbalizations (i.e., the number of times the counselor spoke, in between speeches by the client, regardless of duration) was calculated for each interview and referred to as "Number of total responses."

Each interview yielded scores for each type of counselor verbal behavior. The number of sentence units scored in each category per interview was designated the "frequency score" for that type of counselor response.

Classification of Client Submissive and Aggressive Responses and Objects of Client Responses. The subsidiary aspect of the content analysis was designed to yield scores for each of the counselor verbal behavior categories in terms of the frequency with which they follow each of four kinds of client behavior:

(1) Submissiveness toward the counselor;

(2) Submissiveness toward others;

(3) Aggressiveness toward the counselor;

(4) Aggressiveness toward others.

(a) Classification of Submissive and Aggressive Client Responses. The terms "submissiveness" and "aggressiveness" here used are intended to incorporate two dimensions of behavior which have received considerable attention in the study of client-counselor interaction. The first is the dimension of "Control," which involves the continuum "Dominant-Submissive" (or -nondominant); the other is the dimension of

"Affection," represented by the continuum, "Hostile-Friendly" (or -nonhostile). The study by Heller, Myers and Kline (1963)[1] combines the two dimensions in the four possible ways, represented by four different client-actor roles. Thus, in this study, the "aggressive" client demeanor tends to be dominant and hostile (or unfriendly); the "submissive" client behavior tends to be dependent and nonhostile.

Each interview with the submissive client was rated for dependent responses by the client. For aggressive client interviews, responses which expressed negative or hostile attitudes toward others were coded as such. The definitions for aggressive and submissive behavior which were used were derived from the work of Bandura, Lipsher and Miller (1960)[2] on hostility and the work of Winder et al. (1962)[3] on dependency. Summary definitions, as found in the dissertation of Kopplin (1965),[4] are presented here.

> Hostility statements include description or expression of unfavorable, critical, sarcastic, depreciatory remarks; oppositional attitudes; antagonism, argument, expression of dislike, disagreement, resentment, resistance, irritation, annoyance, anger; expression of aggression and punitive behavior, and aggressive domination. Hostility which the client directs against himself is not scored as hostility.

---

[1] Heller, Myers and Kline, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

[2] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[3] Winder, Ahmad, Bandura and Rau, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

[4] Kopplin, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

> Dependency statements include expressions of need to depend on someone, to let someone else take the initiative in conversation or action, to be told what to do, to be helped, to be cured by an outside agent; description of dependent behavior (in situation outside counseling session); approval-seeking and concern about disapproval; dependent (excessively passive) agreement with others; making personal security contingent upon another; expression of concern about parental plans and expectations regarding oneself; expression of need to confide in, write to, or communicate with parental figures; discussion of relationship between oneself and therapist (in terms of nurturance).

(b) Classification of Objects of Client Responses. As dependent or aggressive client responses were identified for the designated segments of each interview, each was evaluated for the object person to which the submissiveness or hostility referred. Dependent or aggressive client remarks which do not refer to any object, "Counselor" or "Other," were not included in the scoring. The categories of object originally adopted for use in this project, and also derived from the work of Bandura and his colleagues, were as follows:

Counselor (or counseling)	Other
	Client's parents
	Client's peers
	Client's professors
	Client's spouse
	Client's employers
	Others; others-in-general

Although the experimenter's ratings were made in terms of these categories, it was thought likely, even beforehand, that frequencies would be low for the subcategories in particular, and that, therefore, only the global comparison of "Counselor vs Other Persons" would be possible to report.

Scoring of Counselor Responses to Client Responses Directed at Object-Persons. For each interview, frequency scores were

were calculated for each category of counselor response following a client aggressive or submissive response focussed on some object person. For this analysis, as in the main analysis of the study, the "Number of sentence units" and "Number of total responses" were also tallied for each interview.

Treatment of the Recorded Interviews

Typecripts. Typescripts were prepared from tape-recordings of each of the sixty-two interviews in this study, for use by the raters in conjunction with the audio-tapes.

Segmentation. Considerable pilot work was done to determine an adequate length of time and action of interviews to be coded. Comparison of the frequencies of responses yielded by an analysis of 5, 10 and 15 minute segments suggested that 15 minutes of interview interaction would provide a sufficient sample of responses for study. Since each counselor had been instructed to begin the interview with an explanation of the apparatus in the counseling rooms, counseling procedures and similar material, it was decided to begin the segment to be coded when the interview was fully underway. The pilot work interviews indicated that, after presenting the introductory remarks to the client, each counselor had his own way of suggesting that the interview proper should begin. It was decided to seek this ending of introduction-beginning of interview proper and to consider this the initial counselor statement. The fifteen minute segment to be coded for this study extended from five minutes

following this initial counselor response, i.e., from the beginning of the sixth minute, to the end of the twentieth minute of the interview. The typescripts were marked for these two points in the interview.

Rating Sheets. In the course of pilot rating of interviews, the experimenter developed a rating sheet on which the counselor responses, client responses, and the object of client responses could be conveniently recorded. A copy of this rating sheet is found in Appendix E. To facilitate recording codes on the rating sheets, scoring symbols or abbreviations were developed. Examples of these are found on the sample rating sheet.

Statistical Procedures

As has been mentioned earlier, for each interview the following frequency scores were tabulated:

(a) Number of each type of counselor responses per interview sample;

(b) Number of sentence units and of total responses per interview sample;

(c) Number of unclassifiable responses per interview sample;

(d) Within each interview sample, number of counselor responses of each type which follow aggressive client responses (in aggressive client interviews) or submissive client responses (in submissive client interviews);

(e) Number of sentence units and of total responses

emitted by counselor in response to aggressive or submissive client responses.

These frequency scores were punched on IBM cards, so that each counselor was represented by six cards:

Frequency of each category of counselor responses:

1. in total submissive client interview segment (15 min.)
2. in total aggressive client interview segment;
3. to submissive responses by the client toward the counselor;
4. to submissive responses by the client toward others;
5. to aggressive responses by the client toward the counselor;
6. to aggressive responses by the client toward others.

The first outputs by the computer were a tally of frequency scores, in terms of the six groups listed above, and calculations of means and standard deviations for each of the counselor response categories, for all counselors. Since the nature of neither the frequencies nor the frequency distributions could be known beforehand, it was decided to determine the need for combining categories, as well as the appropriate further statistical procedures, on the basis of this initial computational output.

Frequency scores are presented in the following chapter in terms of the original twenty-one counselor response variables, along with description and explanation of the combination of these categories for the purpose of analyzing the data of this study.

The next statistical procedure employed in this investigation was the calculation of "difference scores" for each counselor-subject. For each counselor, differences were calculated, for each type of counselor verbal response including

number of sentences and total responses, between the submissive and the aggressive client interview segments (Cards 1 vs. 2), between counselor behavior following submissive client responses focussed on the counselor vs. others (Cards 3 vs. 4), and between counselor behaviors following aggressive client responses focussed on the counselor vs. others (Cards 5 vs. 6). Thus, for each counselor-subject, three difference scores were calculated. These comprised the summary data to be used in trsting Hypothesis I and the two aspects of Hypothesis II. The statistic employed in testing the hypotheses was the *t* test for differences between correlated means.

Reliability Test Procedures

The test of reliability was provided by having a reliability test judge, a school counselor with about three years of experience, independently rate a sample of approximately 20% of the experimental interviews. Random sampling was used to select from the set of interviews six which were to be used in the reliability test procedure.

Interviews from the Psychological Consultation Center counseling practica at Teachers College, Columbia University, from the American Academy of Psychotherapists Tape Library, and four randomly selected interview protocols from the present study had been selected for use in pilot work and practice of rating prior to the actual reliability test judgments.

In pilot work, the experimenter had made efforts to note categories which were easily confused with others or otherwise unclear and to include clarification of these in the manual of definitions.

Approximately eight hours were spent in training the reliability test judge in classifying the tapes using the analytical systems of this study. First, the rater was informed of the basic counseling analogue paradigm. She was told that the interviews involved various counselors speaking with two actors, but neither the research topic nor the fact that the actor roles were designated "aggressive" and "submissive," respectively, were included in the description.

The practice session then involved presentation of the manual of definitions, with discussion and clarification of the categories. It proceeded with coding of one interview followed by comparing and discussing the two ratings, then continuing with rating another interview, and so forth. Just as did the experimenter, the reliability test judge used typescripts along with the tape-recordings, and wrote the coding symbols on the rating sheets designed for that purpose. To avoid contamination in scoring, each judge scored each response before listening to the following response.

The judge was then given the twelve interviews which had been selected for use in the reliability test, along with other necessary materials; she independently rated these

interviews over the next several days.

The reliability test procedure was designed to include an indication of the reliability of ratings of interviews with different "client-types" and the reliability of ratings made over a period of time. For each of the six sampled interview numbers, both the aggressive and submissive interviews were included in the reliability test procedure. The experimenter rated approximately one-third of the interview tapes in each of three time periods: July, 1968, January, 1969, and February, 1969. This permitted analysis of the effect of time span on reliability of ratings.

Reliability analysis consisted of comparing each sentence unit classification by the experimenter with the corresponding sentence unit coded by the reliability test judge, and tallying "Agreement" or "Disagreement." The percent of responses for which there was agreement between the two ratings divided by the total number of sentence units constituted the reliability index for each interview.

When disagreement was based upon either the experimenter or judge scoring an extra unit not scored by the other, this was tallied as "Disagreement" and added to the total number of units for the interview. The procedure thus included testing for agreement in determination of sentence units, as well as agreement in rating content of the responses.

The mean percents of agreement are presented as reliability indices in Chapter Three.

Since only the experimenter rated all sixty-two interviews, research analyses were made on the basis of her coding.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Reliability Test of Counselor Response Ratings

Combination of Counselor Response Categories

The initial phase of data analysis was the calculation of frequency scores for counselor responses to the aggressive and submissive client, respectively. The means and standard deviations of these scores for the thirty-one counselors are presented in Table 2.

It will be noted that many of the categories of counselor verbal behavior were expressed with only low frequency. In fact, fifteen of the twenty response categories had a frequency of less than five. Because the low frequency would tend to make interpretation and reliability rather weak, it was decided to combine categories before analysis of that data was undertaken.

One striking contrast which may be noted here, with reference to Table 2, is in the total amount of responses emitted by counselors to the two different client "stimuli." There is a clear tendency to emit more "sentence units" and "total responses" in sessions with the aggressive client. (For "sentence units," $t = -4.41$, 30 d.f., $p < .01$; for "total responses," $t = -3.37$, 30 d.f., $p < .01$.)

Table 2

Frequency of Twenty-one Kinds of Counselor Responses in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client-Actor (N = 31)

Counselor Response Category	Submissive Interview Mean	SD	Aggressive Interview Mean	SD
Reassurance	2.7	2.4	0.8	1.4
Approval	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.5
Tension Release	0.7	1.1	0.5	1.0
Suggestion	3.2	3.0	2.3	3.1
Persuasion	0.4	0.8	0.4	1.1
Structuring	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.3
Opinion	2.1	2.8	1.5	1.8
Information	2.8	3.9	2.5	2.4
Interpretation	7.3	4.1	11.7	5.6
Request for Information	5.4	4.2	6.0	5.1
Request for Elaboration	4.9	3.3	5.6	3.0
Reflection	5.8	4.6	4.0	3.1
Nondirective Lead	0.2	0.6	0.4	1.1
Simple Acceptance	6.6	5.7	14.1	11.6
Silence	4.3	4.6	11.6	9.9
Expression of Tension	1.1	1.5	3.6	4.0
Misunderstanding	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.7
Avoidance	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.8
Disapproval, disagreement	0.5	0.8	1.9	2.3
Antagonism	1.6	9.0	0.3	0.8
Unclassifiable Responses	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Number of Sentence Units	50.7	13.8	69.5	20.4
Number of Total Responses	30.3	9.3	39.4	13.5

Rationale for Combining Categories

Most of the low frequency categories were originally formed, as noted in Chapter II, by subdividing Gamsky's list of counselor responses on the basis of the work of other researchers and theorists. Thus, the "collapsing" of categories in most cases involved recombining subcategories into a format more like Gamsky's content analysis system. This accounts for the following categories:

(a) Suggestion-Persuasion-Structuring (henceforth to be referred to as "Suggestion");

(b) Request for Information-Request for Elaboration-Nondirective Lead;

(c) Expression of Tension-Avoidance.

The arrangement of types of counselor verbal behavior adopted as the basis for analysis in this study is presented in Table 3.

First of all, "Reassurance," "Shows Approval," and "Tension Release" are combined for the purposes of this study. Gamsky used these as separate kinds of behavior, but relates them in terms of their order of appearance in both his content analysis system and that of Bales. All three may be seen as ways through which a person may try to provide comfort and easing of tension for another person.

While "Gives Information" was originally a Gamsky category, "Gives Opinion" was "partialled out" of Gamsky's definition of

Table 3

Combined Categories of the Content Analysis System of Counselor Verbal Behavior

(1) Reassurance; Approval; Tension Release.

(2) Suggestion; Persuasion; Structuring.

(3) Opinion; Information.

(4) Interpretation.

(5) Request for Information; Request for Elaboration; Nondirective Lead.

(6) Reflection.

(7) Simple Acceptance.

(8) Silence.

(9) Expression of Tension; Misunderstanding; Avoidance; Disapproval; Antagonism.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(10) Unclassifiable responses.

(11) Number of Sentence Units.

(12) Number of Total Responses (verbalizations).

"Reflection," as explained in Chapter II. This brings the definition of "Reflection" closer to the common usage of the term (e.g., Snyder, 1945;[1] Bandura et al., 1960;[2] Kopplin, 1965[3]). It seems appropriate to use "Gives Information" and "Gives Opinion" as one broad category of activity by the counselor, since both are verbalizations based upon material which constitutes his own general knowledge, "objective" and "subjective."

The use of "Expression of Tension" and "Avoids" in combination with "Misunderstanding," "Disapproval," and "Antagonism" is based upon the use of these categories under the general rubric, "Avoidance" by neo-behavioral researchers (e.g., Bandura et al., 1960;[2] Winder et al., 1962;[4] Kopplin, 1965;[3] Caracena, 1965).[5]

Method and Results of Reliability Test of Counselor Response Ratings

The method used for testing the reliability of all aspects of the content analysis system used in this study was the determi-

---

[1] Snyder, Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 193-223.

[2] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[3] Kopplin, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

[4] Winder, Ahmad, Bandura and Rau, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

[5] Philip F. Caracena, Elicitation of dependency expressions in the initial stage of psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 268-274.

nation of the "frequency of agreement" between the ratings of interview data by the experimenter and corresponding independent ratings by a person who served as "reliability test judge." The reliability test was done employing the combined set of counselor response categories. The procedure has been explained in detail in Chapter II.

The results of the reliability test for rating counselor responses are presented in the following table:

Table 4

Percent of Agreement between Ratings
by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge
of Counselor Responses in Twelve Interviews

Period of Rating by Experimenter	Submiss. Client Interviews		Aggress. Client Interviews		Mean Percent Agreement
Early (July 1968)	# 3	.61	# 3	.78	Mean Early =.70
	#19	.71	#19	.70	
Middle (Jan. 1969)	#11	.71	#11	.73	Mean Mid. = .78
	#26	.81	#26	.85	
Late (Feb. 1969)	#13	.90	#13	.63	Mean Late = .76
	#16	.69	#16	.83	

Mean Subm. = .74 Mean Aggr. = .75
Grand Mean Percent of Agreement = .75

As indicated in Table 4, the percent of agreement between ratings of counseling responses ranges from .61 through .90. The overall mean of .75 indicates that these ratings are reliable enough to provide a basis for analysis of the counselors' verbal behavior in the experimental interviews.

In order to determine whether the reliability of rating counselor responses using this content analysis system is affected by the lapse of time over which the scoring is done, an analysis of variance was performed. A second purpose of this test was to find out if the reliability of coding of submissive and aggressive client interviews differs in degree.

The results are as follows:

Table 5

Analysis of Variance:

Effects of Time Period and Client Type

upon Reliability Test Results

Source	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Time Period	2	.006458	.62 n.s.
Client Type	1	.000675	.06 n.s.
Time x Client	2	.005425	.52 n.s.
Error	6	.010408	
Total	11		

n.s. Not significant at the .05 level.

The above report of the results of the analysis of variance indicates that neither time period of rating nor the type of client demeanor had significant effects upon the reliability of content analysis scores.

Test of Hypothesis I

The basic hypothesis of this study is that counselors tend to respond differentially to clients characterized by different emotional dispositions. Specifically, differences were predicted between counselor responses in interaction with a submissive client and an aggressive client.

The procedure used to test this hypothesis was the *t* test. According to Boneau (1960),[1] "It would appear that the *t* test is functionally a distribution-free test, providing the sample sizes are sufficiently large (say, 30, for extreme violations) and equal."

Table 6 presents means, standard deviations and results of *t* tests of differences between means of counselor responses emitted in interviews with the submissive and aggressive client-actors. Eight of the eleven *t* values are significantly high. On this basis we may reject the null hypothesis and conclude that alternative Hypothesis I is confirmed.

The substantive findings indicated by this analysis are that the counselors tended to respond with "Reassurance" (including giving approval and attempting to relieve tension)

---

[1] Alan C. Boneau, The effects of violations of assumptions underlying the *t* test. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57, 49-64.

Table 6

Frequency of Different Counselor Responses in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client-Actor (N = 31)

Counselor Response Category	Submiss. Interview Mean	SD	Aggress. Interview Mean	SD	t^a	
Reassurance	3.9	3.0	1.5	1.8	3.86	**
Suggestion	4.2	3.2	3.7	4.1	0.52	n.s.
Opinion/Information	5.0	5.2	4.0	3.2	0.98	n.s.
Interpretation	7.3	4.0	11.7	5.6	-3.66	**
Request for Info/ Elaboration	10.5	6.7	11.4	7.0	-1.09	n.s.
Reflection	5.8	4.6	4.0	3.1	2.26	*
Simple Acceptance	6.6	5.7	14.1	11.6	-4.11	**
Silence	4.3	4.6	11.6	9.9	-4.82	**
Avoidance	3.2	3.3	7.2	5.0	-4.60	**
No. of Sentence Units	50.7	13.8	69.5	20.4	-4.41	**
No. of Total Responses	30.3	9.3	39.4	13.5	-3.37	**

[a] Two-tailed tests. Positive t ratios indicate a greater frequency of responses in the submissive client interviews; negative t ratios indicate more responses occurred in the aggressive client interviews.

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
n.s. Not significant at the .05 level.

more often in interaction with the submissive client than with the aggressive client. Also, reflection of feelings or close restatement of the client's expression was a more common response of the counselors to the submissive person. On the other hand, the counselors responded with greater frequency to the aggressive interviewee in terms of "Silence," "Simple Acceptance," "Avoidance," and "Interpretation." In the aggressive client condition, the counselors emitted significantly more total responses and statements. Actually, since it may be seen that silences and simple acceptance comments, e.g., "Mm-hmm," accounted for many of the counselors' responses in the aggressive client interview, we may conclude that the counselors did not actually speak more often or say more, but took up more of the interview with more passive responses.

Reliability Test for Client Response Ratings

Definitions and rating procedures for client responses were presented in Chapter II. The reliability testing consisted of three aspects; the first was percent of agreement between ratings of submissive or aggressive client remarks. As discussed earlier, only those submissive and aggressive statements which were aimed at particular "object persons" were rated.

The results of the reliability test for this first aspect of client response ratings are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Percent of Agreement between Ratings
by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge
of Client Responses in Twelve Interviews

Period of Rating by Experimenter	Submiss. Client Responses		Aggress. Client Responses		Mean Percent Agreement
Early (July 1968)	# 3	.69	# 3	.77	Mean Early =.71
	#19	.72	#19	.67	
Middle (Jan. 1969)	#11	.67	#11	.75	Mean Mid. = .69
	#26	.67	#26	.67	
Late (Feb. 1969)	#13	.67	#13	.73	Mean Late = .65
	#16	.71	#16	.50	

Mean Subm. = .69 Mean Aggr. = .68

Grand Mean Percent of Agreement = .69

The mean percent of agreement on the ratings of client submissive and aggressive responses, .69, is indicative of moderate reliability. In this research project, low frequencies of these client responses in the interview samples was probably the main factor in impeding high reliability in these ratings. For instance, in Interview #16 (Counselor #16) only two aggressive responses focussed upon specific persons were emitted by the client-actor. An error in rating one of these resulted in a reliability index of .50.

The test of reliability presented in Table 8 involves the ratings of the objects of client responses, those individuals upon whom the submissive or aggressive remarks were focussed. Although the original ratings were made in terms of several subcategories of persons otherthan the counselor, the low frequencies found in analyzing the interviews indicated the appropriateness of using simply "Counselor" and "Others" as the categories of object-persons.

The results of this reliability test are dependent in part upon the reliability of ratings for client aggressive and submissive responses. Most of the disagreements in object ratings were due to omission of any rating because one or the other of the raters disagreed as to whether the client response should be regarded as scorable in terms of "aggressiveness" or "submissiveness." To understand the interdependence of the ratings of client response and object of client response,

Table 8

Percent of Agreement between Ratings
by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge
of Objects of Submissive and Aggressive Client Responses
in Twelve Interviews

Period of Rating by Experimenter	"Couns. vs. Others" Objects of Subm. Responses		"Couns. vs. Others" Objects of Aggr. Responses		Mean Percent Agreement
Early (July 1968)	# 3	.75	# 3	.81	Mean Early =.73
	#19	.67	#19	.67	
Middle (Jan. 1969)	#11	.78	#11	.75	Mean Mid. = .72
	#26	.67	#26	.67	
Late (Feb. 1969)	#13	.67	#13	.73	Mean Late = .65
	#16	.71	#16	.50	

Mean Subm. = .71 Mean Aggr. = .69

Grand Mean Percent of Agreement = .70

and to achieve an estimate of the reliability of rating object persons, per se, another analysis was made. Table 9 presents the results of a test of reliability only for those client responses which both raters agreed were scorable. One may note that, given agreement on the scorability of the client emotional response, the reliability of rating object persons is very high. As long as raters agree on the ratings of client submissive or aggressive responses, it is highly likely that the ratings of the object of the response will be in agreement.

Test of Hypothesis II

Determination of Subsamples for Analysis of Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis of this investigation was that there is no difference in counselor verbal behavior in response to aggressive or submissive interviewee statements focused upon the counselor vs. such statements focused upon others.

Low Frequency of Client Aggressive and Submissive Responses. Table 10 summarizes the frequencies of each type of rated client response for the 31 interviews in the submissive and aggressive client conditions, respectively.

One may note from Table 10 that the categories of client submissiveness toward persons other than the counselor and of client aggressiveness focused upon the counselor are especially low in frequency of emission. This seems to coincide with real-life client behavior, evidenced by data in the work of

Table 9

Percent of Agreement between Ratings
by Experimenter and Reliability Test Judge,
of Object of Client Response,
when there is Inter-rater Agreement on the Client Response

Period of Rating by Experimenter	Objects of "Reliable" Subm. Responses	Objects of "Reliable" Aggr. Responses	Mean Percent Agreement
Early (July 1968)	#3 1.00 #19 .94	#3 .86 #19 1.00	Mean Early =.95
Middle (Jan. 1969)	#11 1.00 #26 1.00	#11 1.00 #26 1.00	Mean Mid. =1.00
Late (Feb. 1969)	#13 1.00 #16 1.00	#13 1.00 #16 1.00	Mean Late =1.00

Mean Subm. = .99 Mean Aggr. = .98

Grand Mean Percent of Agreement = .98

Table 10

Mean Frequencies of

Submissive or Aggressive Client Responses, per Interview

(N = 31)

Object of Client Responses	Submissive Client Responses Mean	SD	Aggressive Client Responses Mean	SD
Counselor	5.5	3.9	1.3	1.5
Other Persons	2.5	1.7	5.5	3.9
Mean Totals	7.9	4.5	6.7	4.7

Bandura, Lipsher and Miller (1960).[1] Their research report concerned hostile behavior from clients in the course of actual psychotherapy; their data, also, seemed to indicate this discrepancy in frequency of occurrence between client hostility toward the counselor and hostility directed at others. Four of the twelve counselor-subjects had no interviews which included any hostility directed at them, but all counselors' interviews included client hostility focused on other individuals. Data presented by Winder and his colleagues (1962)[2]

[1] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[2] Winder, Ahmad, Bandura and Rau, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

indicate a clear tendency for real-life clients to focus dependent verbal behavior more frequently on the therapist than on others. Of all the responses in that study's sample of interviews which were rated "dependent responses," 821 were rated as directed at the therapists, while 307 were evaluated to be directed at other persons in the clients' lives.

Thus, in the present study, we have actors, without specific instructions to control output of their aggressive or submissive remarks, who nevertheless may have spontaneously emitted emotional responses with relative frequencies similar to those of actual clients in the course of counseling interviews. However, we are still left, so far as this data analysis is concerned, with the dilemma of analyzing the effect upon counselor responses of such client behavior, with relatively little data available.

Cases with Minimal Number of Relevant Responses. It was decided to focus, for the purposes of this analysis, on those cases in which the counselor emitted a minimum of three responses to aggressive or submissive client verbal behavior. The frequencies of the cases fitting these requirements were as follows:

Table 11

Number of Interviews with Three or More Counselor Responses to Submissive or Aggressive Client Behavior

Type of Client Response	Number of Interviews
Submissive toward the Counselor	27
Submissive toward Other Persons	19
Aggressive toward the Counselor	10
Aggressive toward Other Persons	25

For the purpose of statistical analysis, it was desirable to determine the number of interviews in which the minimal number of counselor responses occurred in both object person conditions, i.e., submissive or aggressive client responses to the counselor as well as to other persons. There turned out to be eighteen such interviews for the submissive client condition and eight for the aggressive client condition.

Method and Results of Test for Hypothesis II

Stated in the form of a null hypothesis, the second prediction of this study was that there are no differences between counselor responses to aggressive or submissive client behavior directed at the counselor vs. directed at other persons.

For this analysis, as for Hypothesis I, *t* tests for dif-

ferences between correlated means were calculated. The means and t values are presented in Table 12.

Thirteen of the twenty-two t values are significantly high. More specifically, eight of the eleven kinds of counselor behaviors are emitted with significantly different frequency in response to client submissiveness focused on the counselor than in response to such behavior directed at other persons. Five of the eleven counselor response categories are emitted with such discrepancies in the aggressive client condition. On this basis we may reject the null hypothesis and conclude that alternative Hypothesis II is confirmed.

The substantive findings indicated by this analysis are that, when client submissiveness was focused on the counselors, the latter tended to respond with "Reassurance" (including giving approval and attempting to relieve tension), "Suggestions" (including persuasion or strongly urged advice and structuring of the interview), "Opinions and Information," as well as "Requests for Information or Elaboration" from the client. Also, client submissiveness focused on the counselor elicited significantly more "Avoidance" behaviors. On the other hand, when the client's submissiveness concerned individuals other than the therapist, counselors tended to employ "Reflection" of the client's feelings more frequently.

When client aggressiveness was focused on people other than the counselor, the latter tended to make more "Requests

Table 12

Frequency of Different Counselor Responses to Client Submissiveness and Aggressiveness Directed at the Counselor vs. Other Persons

Counselor Response Category	Submiss. Interview Couns. (N = 18) Mean	Others Mean	t^a	Aggress. Interview Couns. (N = 8) Mean	Others Mean	t^a
Reassurance	1.9	0.1	3.6**	0.4	0.0	2.1
Suggestion	1.6	0.2	3.2**	0.3	0.9	-1.7
Opinion/Information	1.9	0.3	2.3*	0.6	0.0	2.4*
Interpretation	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.0	2.5	-1.7
Request for Info/ Elaboration	1.9	0.6	3.3**	0.8	2.5	-4.8**
Reflection	0.5	1.1	-2.1*	0.4	0.9	-1.5
Simple Acceptance	1.2	1.1	0.4	0.8	2.3	-2.6*
Silence	0.7	0.3	1.3	1.4	3.0	-1.4
Avoidance	1.4	0.3	3.2**	1.3	1.4	-0.3
No. of Sentence Units	12.7	5.3	4.3**	6.8	14.5	-4.8**
No. of Total Responses	6.3	3.3	3.4**	3.4	8.0	-4.6**

[a] Two-tailed tests. Positive t ratios indicate a greater frequency of responses by the counselor to the client's counselor-directed emotional behavior; negative t ratios indicate more counselor responses to client emotional behavior directed at other persons.

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

for Information or Elaboration" from the client. This kind of behavior also tended to elicit more "Simple Acceptance" than did aggressiveness to therapists. When the client was aggressive toward the counselors themselves, the latter tended to give more "Opinions or Information." Contrary to expectations perhaps, there were no significant differences in "Avoidance" behaviors among the counselors in this study, in relation to whether the client was aggressive toward the therapist or toward others.

Further Analysis of the Counselor Response Data

The manner in which counselor behavior has been analyzed in the previous sections has been in relation to the hypotheses of this study. Both of the hypotheses involved comparison of counselors' responses in interviewing one "client type" with their responses in interviewing the other "client type" under consideration. It seems appropriate to an understanding of what counselors actually do in interaction with aggressive and submissive individuals to view the patterns of responses within each interview condition, apart from whether the behaviors differ from those in the other situation.

Table 13 presents a summary of the relative frequencies of each kind of counselor response to the submissive and aggressive clients, respectively.

Table 13

Ranked Mean Frequency per Interview
of Different Counselor Responses
in Interviews with a Submissive and an Aggressive Client

Submissive Client (N = 31)		Aggressive Client (N = 31)	
		Simple Acceptance	14.1
		Interpretation	11.7
		Silence	11.6
		Request for Information/Elaboration	11.4
Request for Information/Elaboration	10.5		
Interpretation	7.3	Avoidance	7.2
Simple Acceptance	6.6		
Reflection	5.8		
Opinion/Information	5.0		
Silence	4.3	Opinion/Information	4.0
Suggestion	4.2	Reflection	4.0
Reassurance	3.9	Suggestion	3.7
Avoidance	3.2		
		Reassurance	1.5
Mean Total No. Of Sentence Units	50.7		69.5

There seem to be similarities in counselors' patterns of responding, in addition to differences related to the different client conditions.

In both interviews, counselors tended to request information and elaboration, offer interpretations of the client's situation, and respond with simple acceptance with considerable frequency. In addition, "approach" responses far outnumber "avoidance" behaviors. A combination of "directive" (e.g., "interpretations") and "nondirective" responses are employed, with the greater emphasis on the latter, so far as frequencies of sentence units are concerned.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Relationship between Present Study and Previous Research

Results of Hypothesis I

Counselor Responses to Submissive vs. Aggressive Clients. The data analyzed in this study have indicated the counselors respond to a submissive client in ways which differ significantly from their reactions to an aggressive person. In interaction with a submissive person, the counselors in this experiment tended to respond with more reassurance, giving approval and trying to relieve tension, and with reflection or restatement of the client's feelings. Aggressiveness evoked silence, simple acceptance, avoidance behaviors and interpretations to a much greater extent. Basically, the differential reactions of the counselors may be expressed in the following way, that submissive people tend to evoke more "parental" and "understanding" behavior from counselors, while aggressive people are more frequently reacted to with quiet passivity and with disapproving or even antagonistic feelings.

Relationship of Hypothesis I to Findings of Previous Research

The results stated above are in basic agreement with the findings of previous studies exploring the interaction of counselors with dependent or hostile people.

When referring to the behaviors which the submissive client in particular tended to evoke in the counselors, it seemed appropriate to use the word, "parental," as did Warkentin and Leland,[1] in describing the "oral-dependent" person. Bohn's (1965)[2] finding that the dependent client "stimulus" elicited more "dominant" responses than did the "typical" or "hostile" client is corroborated by the data in this study. Bohn's definition of "dominant" behavior was based upon Snyder's (1945)[3] categories of "Reassurance," "Persuasion," "Direct Question," and "Forcing the Topic." These types of behavior are similar to the pattern which the counselors in this study exhibited to a greater extent with the submissive client than with the aggressive client.

The study by Gamsky and Farwell (1966)[4] provides the most complete set of data which may be compared with this study of counselors interacting with an aggressive client. In Table 14 the findings of Gamsky and Farwell are presented along with those of the present study.

---

[1] John Warkentin and Tom Leland, Human character traits. American Academy of Psychotherapists Tape Library, Volume #4.

[2] Martin J. Bohn, Jr. Counselor behavior as a function of counselor dominance, counselor experience, and client type. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12 (4), 346-352.

[3] William U. Snyder, An investigation of the nature of nondirective psychotherapy. Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 193-223.

[4] Neal R. Gamsky and Gail F. Farwell. Counselor verbal behavior as a function of client hostility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 184-190.

Table 14

Comparison of Significant Findings

in Two Studies of Counselor Verbal Responses to Clients

	Gamsky and Farwell	Present Study
	<u>Hostile</u>	<u>Aggressive</u>
	Reflection	
	Asks for Information	
		Silence
		Simple Acceptance
		Interpretation
*	Avoidance/Disagreement	Avoidance
*	Total No. of Responses	No. of Sentence Units
	<u>Friendly</u>	<u>Submissive</u>
	Gives Information	
		Reflection
*	Approval	Reassurance
	<u>No Differences</u>	<u>No Differences</u>
	Interpretation	
	Agreement	
		Opinion/Information
*	Asks for Elaboration	Request for Information/ Elaboration
*	Suggestion	Suggestion

* Agreement between data of Gamsky and Farwell and of present study. Categories which are presented on the same line are equivalent or overlapping in definition, even though the titles used in the respective studies are not the same.

The findings of the present study agree with those presented by Gamsky and Farwell to a considerable degree, although not completely. Both studies found that aggressive clients elicit more total responses and more avoidance behavior, than do nonhostile clients. Both found that counselors offered more support (reassurance/approval) to the nonhostile client. In both studies, there was no significant difference in counselor use of suggestions or requests for elaboration in talking with the aggressive vs. the nonaggressive person.

On the other hand, there was disagreement between the studies in the findings concerning reflection, interpretation, giving information, and asking for information. While there was a slightly greater frequency of Agreement in response to the hostile client of the Gamsky and Farwell study than to the friendly client. This difference is not nearly as striking as that involving "simple acceptance" in the present study. Finally, there was no category of "silence," per se, in the Gamsky rating procedure.

Russell and Snyder (1963)[1] found greater anxiety in counselor reaction to a hostile client than to a friendly person. This result is supported by the findings of this study. Referring to our data in terms of the original twenty-one cate-

---

[1] Peter D. Russell and William U. Snyder, Counselor anxiety in relation to the amount of clinical experience and quality of affect demonstrated by the client. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 22, 358-363.

gories (Table I), the analysis of "Avoidance" behaviors emitted by counselors may be seen in Table 15.

Table 15

Avoidance Behaviors Emitted by Counselors in the Present Study (N = 31)

Submissive Client	Mean	Aggressive Client	Mean
Antagonism	1.6	Expression of Tension	3.6
Avoidance	1.3	Disapproval	1.9
Expression of Tension	1.1	Avoidance	1.2
Disapproval	0.5	Misunderstanding	0.3
Misunderstanding	0.2	Antagonism	0.3
No. of Sentence Units per Interview	50.7	No. of Sentence Units per Interview	69.5

The preceding table enables us to examine more closely the specific kinds of avoidance behaviors emitted by counselors in the experimental interviews of this study. Counselors expressed more tension in interacting with the aggressive client. Thus, the present study concurs with that of Russell and Snyder. While the counselors express more disapproval or

disagreement in talking with the aggressive client, they were more openly critical with the submissive client, to whom they made more antagonistic remarks.

Results of Hypothesis II

Counselor Responses to Submissive Client Remarks Focused on the Counselor vs. Others. The results of data analysis in this study indicated that the counselors emitted more reassurance, suggestions, opinions and information, and requested more information and elaboration when client submissiveness was directed at themselves. This personal focus of dependency also evoked more avoidance from counselors than did submissiveness to other persons. When the client expressed dependency needs involving others, the counselors tried more often to reflect the client's feelings.

Relationship of Hypothesis II (Submissive Client) data to Previous Research. Snyder (1963)[1] suggests that counselors give more support when dependency is directed at themselves than when it is directed at others. This is supported in the present study by the greater frequency of reassurance, including giving approval and attempts to relieve tension.

Counselor Responses to Aggressive Client Remarks focused on the Counselor vs. Others. In this study, the counselors tended to give opinions and information more frequently when

---

[1] William U. Snyder, Dependency in psychotherapy. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

clients were aggressive to themselves rather than toward other persons. In the latter situation, counselors showed more simple acceptance and requests for elaboration and information.

Relationship of Hypothesis II (Aggressive Client) data to Previous Research. The results on this aspect of the present study are shown along with those of Gamsky and Farwell in Table 16.

Table 16

Comparison of Counselor Responses to Aggressiveness/Hostility Directed at Different Object Persons

	GAMSKY AND FARWELL	PRESENT STUDY
	Hostility to Counselor	Aggressiveness to Counselor
	Reassurance	Opinion/Information
	Suggestion	
	Asks for Elaboration	
	Asks for Information	
	Hostility to Others	Aggressiveness to Others
	Reflection	
	Interpretation	
	Gives Information	
		Request for Information/ Elaboration
*	Agreement	Simple Acceptance

* Agreement between data of Gamsky and Farwell and of present study. Categories which are presented on the same line are equivalent or overlapping in definition, even though the titles used in the respective studies are not the same.

As may be seen above, both studies indicate simple acceptance (or "agreement") is more often a response to hostility directed at others than to hostility toward counselors themselves. However, other findings are in conflict.

The low frequencies in this aspect of the present study, i.e., analysis of counselor responses to aggressiveness directed at specific object persons, demand a reserved attitude about accepting the results as reliable information. In addition to this, differences in the design of the Gamsky study and that of the present investigation are likely to be a factor in explaining the differences in these results. Gamsky asked the client-actors to emphasize hostility to "their parents" and "others-in-general" in the first ten minutes of the experimental interview, and then to switch to emphasizing hostility toward the counselor and the counseling process in the last ten minutes. When the phase of rating the counselor responses took place, the raters were told to rate all the counselor responses for the two 10-minute segments. The findings which Gamsky presents in terms of "Counselor responses to client hostility focused on different objects," are based upon <u>all</u> the counselor responses in the second 10-minute segment compared with all the counselor responses in the first 10-minute segment. Gamsky did not have the raters select only those counselor responses which immediately followed specifically hostile remarks by the client-actors, as was done in this study.

It is hard to say exactly why the results are different, but it probably has something to do with both the low frequencies we found and the differences in design for producing the data which were used in the analyses.

Implications of the Results of the Present Study

Theoretical Implications

This investigation has reaffirmed the suggestion of previous related studies thatc clients with different emotional characteristics tend to elicit different reactions in the person with them in a counseling dyad. This group of studies supports the model of client-counselor interactions as relationships involving mutual elicitation effects, in which not only the patient, but the therapist as well, is influenced by the real stimulus qualities of the other person.

There is no clear sense yet of the relative influence of role expectations, personality and situational variables upon behavior in interpersonal interactions, or specifically in counseling dyads. Social psychological role theory (e.g., Rommetveit, 1955;[1] Newcomb, Turner and Converse, 1965[2]) suggests that while the professional person's role expectations constitute a major factor upon which he or she has been trained

---

[1] R. Rommetveit, Social norms and roles: Explorations in the psychology of enduring pressures. Minneapolis: University of Minneasota Press, 1955.

[2] Theodore M. Newcomb, Ralph H. Turner, and Philip E. Converse. Social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

to base his behavior, personality tendencies or the stimuli of the situation provide "pulls" which influence actual behavior as well. The effects of these influences tend to be more noticeable the more salient or powerful the perceived inner or external stimuli are.

The factor of degree of salience or extremity of the emotional stimuli provided by the client's behavior may account for the discrepancy between findings of the studies by Bandura, Lipsher and Miller (1960)[1] and those of Heller and his colleagues. The Bandura study found significant effects on therapists' behavior of certain ratings of personal characteristics as well as client hostility. Myers, Heller, Logue and Paddock (1962)[2] found no evidence of the influence of personality on counselors' interview behavior. They had tested this by calculating correlations between results of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and other paper and pencil measures taken by the subjects of the study with observer ratings of the counselors' interview behavior, based upon the Leary Interpersonal Checklist. While part of the explanation may be in terms of the differences in personality variables and the measures used, another explanatory factor may be that in the Myers, Heller, et al. research, the client stimuli were provided by actors instructed specifically to communicate hostility, rather than by real in-therapy patients as in the

---

[1] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[2] Roger A. Myers, Kenneth Heller, Patrick E. Logue, and Jere D. Paddock, Personality correlates of evoked interviewer behavior. Unpublished manuscript, 1962.

Bandura study. The actors' behavior may have been less mitigated by other stimulus tendencies than the behavior of the real clients. The actors may thus have provided aggressive stimuli of greater salience than that of the real clients, so that personality variations of the therapists were outweighed by the effects of the situational variable.

Practical Implications

Counselor Behavior and Counseling Practice. It has been suggested by several studies of approach and avoidance characteristics of counselor behavior (Bandura et al., 1960;[1] Winder et al., 1962;[2] Caracena, 1965;[3] Schuldt, 1966[4]) that avoidance reactions from therapists tend to inhibit further expression of the preceding kinds of behavior on the part of the client. Avoidance fails to communicate to the other person that verbal expression of such feelings is appropriate, acceptable, and safe. The "avoided" emotional behaviors may become less accessible to exploration by the client or the counselor.

In this study, counselor behaviors in response to aggres-

---

[1] Bandura, Lipsher and Miller, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

[2] Winder, Ahmad, Bandura and Rau, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

[3] Caracena, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 268-274.

[4] Schuldt, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 178-183.

sive and submissive individuals, to a significant degree, parallel the common interpersonal response patterns in relationships with such people. As various theorists and researchers have suggested (e.g., Leary, 1957;[1] Bandura and Walters, 1963),[2] dependent people tend to evoke comforting and care-taking responses, while aggressive individuals tend to evoke passive or active avoidance responses from others.

Sometimes the psychologist experiencing these common response "pulls" can put them to therapeutic use. However, some negative possibilities exist. Counselors may contribute to the maintenance of unhealthy behavior in the counseling situation. They may be gratifying neurotic needs to be infantile or to be rejected as do others in the client's personal environment.

The tendency of counselors to respond to submissive and aggressive clients in ways similar to the average person is exacerbated when the client's emotional behavior is specifically directed at the counselors themselves. Newcomb, Turner and Converse (1965)[3] suggest that "reward (begets) reward" or "distress (begets) distress" sequences in interpersonal interactions are more likely to occur when "one person perceives the other's responses as being an implied evaluation of himself or

---

[1] Leary, Interpersonal diagnosis of personality.

[2] Albert Bandura and Richard H. Walters, Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

[3] Newcomb, Turner and Converse, Social psychology.

his cherished values." An implication which may follow from the results of this study is that gratification or rejection of the client is more likely to be evoked when the latter's submissive or aggressive emotional responses are focused on the therapist, just as occurs in other kinds of dyads.

In an article concerning interpersonal influence in counseling and therapy relationships, Heller (1963)[1] suggested that counselors "must decide whether they will encourage or inhibit a patient's defensive maneuvers to pull counter-responses from them," in terms of desired behavior change goals. In the light of the previous discussion of the interaction of role values with other determining factors, such efforts to function on the basis of role values are probably often modified by personality tendencies and cultural and institutional pressures.

As suggested earlier, another implication of the data in this study may be that counselors tend to respond to aggressiveness and submissiveness in some ways which are similar to the responses given to these emotional behaviors by the general population.

On the other hand, analysis of counselor responses in this investigation has also indicated that there is considerable agreement in kinds of counselor behaviors across different interview conditions. With both the submissive and the aggres-

---

[1] Kenneth Heller, Experimental analogues of psychotherapy: The clinical relevance of laboratory findings on social influence. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1963, 137, 420-426.

sive clients, the subjects in this study expressed frequent requests for information and elaboration, simple acceptance, and interpretive comments concerning the client. Approach responses greatly outnumbered avoidance responses. The therapists used both active or "directive" techniques, such as interpretation, and more receptive, nondirective responses, but leaned toward use of the latter.

The finding of considerable consistency in counselor behaviors with different kinds of clients suggests the existence of a pattern which may be referred to as "general interviewer or counselor behavior." The nature of the sessions conducted in this project were half-hour initial "disposition" interviews. Thus it may be more accurate to hypothesize that the kinds of behavior pattern described here may constitute at least a general counseling style for initial contacts with clients.

Implications for Counselor Training. Previous researchers (e.g., Gamsky, 1965[1]) have suggested that counselors in training might benefit from practice with clients, selected in terms of their emotional demeanor. Gamsky suggested that experience in counseling interaction with hostile people could be gained by using tape-recordings or client actors, as well as actual patients.

There already have been programs developed based upon ideas of this nature (e.g., Bohn, 1967).[2] It is possible that the

---

[1] Gamsky, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

[2] Bohn, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 195-198.

value of such learning experiences could enhanced, the more explicit and organized the opportunity for analysis of the client-situational factors on the trainee's functioning.

Gamsky (1965)[1] suggested three counselor training techniques directly related to the procedures of this study:

(a) Encounters with clients characterized by different kinds of emotional demeanor;

(b) Practice in explicit analysis of one's own and other counselors' responses by content analysis of tape-recorded interviews, using a scoring manual such as the one developed for this investigation;

(c) Sessions in which client-actors give feedback to counselors.

In the course of clinical training, students on their own as well as with practicum supervisors have commonly tried to become aware of particular patient characteristics which arouse emotional responses, especially uncomfortable ones, in themselves. Perhaps one source of decision-making concerning the kinds of "client types" to select for this kind of training could be the self-knowledge and expressed needs of the counselors in training. Another source may be research such as that of Howard, Orlinsky and Hill (1969)[2] who reported that

---

[1] Gamsky, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

[2] Kenneth I. Howard, David E. Orlinsky, and James A. Hill, The therapist's feelings in the therapeutic process. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25 (1), 83-93.

male therapists expressed considerable discomfort with female patients who behaved erotically toward them, and that female therapists expressed anxious feelings when relating to female clients characterized by considerable dependency.

There is a need for explicit study of the interpersonal response pulls of different kinds of emotional behavior, with the purpose of focusing, for the therapist in training, on the possibilities for appropriate and inappropriate responses. Theorists even predating Freud have described types of patients, individual case histories, and the reactions of the actual therapist or of therapists in general. Scattered throughout psychotherapy literature are views on how to respond to particular kinds of patient behavior in therapeutic ways, in terms of the theory of the writers. However, in psychology training as well as in the field generally, there does not seem to be a systematic focus on effects of client behaviors of various specific "types" on counselors' functioning.

To some extent, the learning process concerning therapeutic responses to the emotional "pulls" of different kinds of people may be specific, rather than readily generalizable. Bohn (1967)[1] found that, after training sessions involving practice with a client-actress, subjects became less directive in response to hostile client stimuli but did not change significantly in this regard toward dependent client stimuli. One

---

[1] Bohn, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 195-198.

reason for this may be that dependent individuals, as such, have a stronger tendency to elicit dominant responses from others. However, another possibility may have to do with the nature of the training.

The two client-actresses who participated in Bohn's training procedures were described as "chronically delinquent" in relation to certain college rules. It may be that the client stimuli they provided the student subjects thus tended to resemble the hostile kind of client more than the dependent client. Thus, it is possible that the greater change in behavior toward the hostile client may be partly due to more effective transfer of training because of greater similarity between the training and the hostile client experimental stimuli. If this is accurate, it suggests a need for exposure to a variety of different kinds of "client types," since the transfer of training may be specific rather than general.

Limitations of the Present Study

Most of the limitations of the project are fairly typical faults in clinical research, especially studies which attempt a "naturalistic" approach involving actual counselors or clients, or both. The commonness of course does not diminish the seriousness of the fault, but is indicative of the difficulty of doing such research.

For one thing, the fact that this is a counseling "analogue" is a limitation, if one wishes to study and relate in-

formation to "real life." The researcher is called upon to make choices in the compromise between control of relevant variables and the complexity of actual situations.

Second, it is difficult to select therapists randomly in a study such as reported here. A student group available to volunteer is often the source of subjects. In the sample of counselors participating in this project, only a rather narrow range of training experience is represented. While a few subjects had considerable counseling experience, the rest were near the end of a master's or doctoral program which included the associate field work. Thus, the variable of length of experience cannot be clearly accounted for here.

Only a moderate level of reliability was achieved in rating the content analysis variables. In this investigation, the most stringent technique, item by item agreement, was used to arrive at reliability indices. In many studies, the coefficients reported are based upon less exact procedures, such as rank correlation over total interviews, and thus appear to have higher levels of reliability.

In the opinion of this researcher, a very serious limitation of this research design is its failure to include a variable which represents quality of the outcome of the counselor-client interaction or competence of the counselors.

Suggestions for Further Research

The last criticism of this study suggests a need for another investigation which incorporates indices of counselor

competence and/or the relationship of counselor behavior vis-a-vis submissive and aggressive clients to the achievement of desirable behavior change in the persons involved.

There seems to be a need for and potential value to be gained from further exploration of the client-counselor interaction using other client "stimulus characteristics." In a study of counselor responses to dependent clients, Schuldt (1966)[1] suggested that "transference manifestations," "indices of independence," and "affect expressions" might be valuable foci of future research.

Self-report studies such as that of Howard, Orlinsky and Hill (1969)[2] which present client and counselor descriptions of feelings following therapy sessions may be sources of kinds of client stimuli which have strong response pull effects on therapists and should be the subject of more specific and detailed study.

The question of psychologists in terms of "personal" vs. "professional" behavioral determination might be an interesting issue to explore in further research related to the present study. Basically, the purpose would be to explore further the factor of perceived role expectations or the effects of professional training on the reactions of people to different kinds of interpersonal stimuli. A possible experimental design might involve, not only client actors representing individuals

---

[1] Schuldt, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 178-183.

[2] Howard, Orlinsky, and Hill, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25 (1), 83-93.

with different emotional demeanor, but also systematic variation of the role expectations of the interviewers. In the present study, all the counselors were requested to take on the function of counselors, doing intake interviews as adjuncts to the college counseling center. In another study, the researcher might request one group of subjects to relate to hostile and submissive individuals as "friends," and another group to relate as "counselors." This design should involve "matched pairs" of subjects, with explicit knowledge of other subject characteristics which might be of major relevance.

Another variable has been mentioned as possibly relevant in explaining the relative effects of the multiple factors which determine counselor responses. This was the degree of salience or extremity of client emotional characteristics. It might be of value to study whether and how counselors respond differently to mild, moderate and extreme hostility, submissiveness and other emotional stimuli. One purpose might be to test the suggestion made earlier that counselor behavior is more likely to be determined by client response "pulls" the more extreme the behavior emitted by the client.

If counselor subjects were requested to indicate, using a shecklist or some other device, their conception of appropriate counselor demeanor prior to the experimental sessions, it would be possible to test whether their actual interview behavior conforms more to descriptions of common effects of different types of client stimuli or to their own description

of their role expectations. Another hypothesis which could be tested in such a study might be that milder client emotional expression would evoke a greater variety of therapist responses, while extreme client behavior would be related to less variance in counselor reactions.

Another suggestion made earlier by this researcher was that training or experience with emotional stimuli of a particular "client type" might generalize only rather narrowly, so that change in therapist behaviors would be found to a greater degree with similar clients. Hoffman (1959)[1] reported that, although personality measures were not found to be significantly related to counselors' use of particular kinds of responses, their previous role experience (as teachers, residence hall counselors, etc.) did have significant relationship to their present interview behaviors. A related study might involve counselors who have, for a considerable time, had experience mainly with particular types of patients, e.g., so-called juvenile delinquents or prisoners, or chronically hospitalized individuals. The design would assume or test for relatively consistent emotional differences in the client stimuli which characterized the work experience of different therapist groups. Would therapists experienced in relating to supposedly aggressive, or passive-dependent, etc. "client types" tend to respond differently to that kind of person than

---

[1] A. E. Hoffman, An analysis of counselor sub-roles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 61-67.

other therapists with different experience? How would therapists used to working with one type of client tend to respond to rather different client stimuli?

In the opinion of this researcher, there is a need for more descriptive data on the nature of counselors' behavior in interactions with different kinds of clients. Even in doctoral dissertations, which are usually lengthy and filled with data presentations, the researchers have rarely included basic data such as frequency distributions of counselor responses, apart from the specific calculations involved in testing the hypotheses of their studies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this investigation was to study the verbal behavior of counselors emitted in response to different emotional dispositions of clients. Aggressive and submissive client "stimuli" were the focus of study.

Two members of a college drama group, trained in the role of a submissive and an aggressive client, respectively, were interviewed by thirty-one counselors, who had been requested to conduct intake or "disposition" interviews with these "students on the college counseling center waiting list."

The half-hour tape-recorded interviews were analyzed for counselors' verbal behavior using a revision of Bales' (1950)[1] Interaction Process Analysis system, developed by Gamsky (1965).[2] The major hypotheses of this study were that differences would be found between counselors' responses to clients with these different emotional dispositions, aggressive and submissive, as well as to such client behavior aimed at themselves as contrasted with such responses directed at other people.

For each interview, rating scores indicated the frequency

---

[1] Robert F. Bales, Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.

[2] Neal R. Gamsky, The effect of client demeanor and focus of hostility upon the responses of school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

of each of a series of different kinds of counselor verbal behaviors. The statistical procedure used in testing the hypotheses was the *t* test.

The results of the data analysis indicated that counselors do emit significantly different verbal behavior in response to aggressive vs. submissive client behavior, as well as to such behavior aimed at themselves rather than toward others. Submissive individuals elicit "comforting" reactions and reflections of their feelings significantly more than do aggressive individuals. The latter, on the other hand, tend to evoke more passivity, more avoidance, and more active interpretive responses from counselors. The two "client types" elicited no significant differences in counselors' giving of opinions, information or suggestions, nor in requests for information or elaborations from the client.

When clients focus aggressiveness on counselors, the latter respond with more information or opinions, than when client aggressiveness is directed toward others. The second condition tended to evoke more simple acceptance ("Mm-hmm's") and requests for information or elaboration.

Submissiveness aimed at the counselors evoked more reassurance, suggestions, information- and opinion-giving, as well as more avoidance responses, than did submissiveness directed toward others. When clients expressed dependency

concerning other people, counselors emitted more reflection of feelings.

Discussion of the results of the study included some suggestions concerning the implications of these findings, as well as ideas for further research.

REFERENCES

Auld, Frank, Jr. and White, Alice Marsden. Sequential dependencies in psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 100-104.

Bales, Robert F. Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.

Bandura, Albert, Lipsher, David H. and Miller, Paula B. Psychotherapists' approach-avoidance reactions to patients' expressions of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.

Bandura, Albert and Walters, Richard H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Berzins, Juris I. and Seidman, Edward. Subjective reactions of A and B quasi-therapists to schizoid and neurotic communications: A replication and extension. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 342-347.

Berzins, Juris I. and Seidman, Edward. Differential therapeutic responding of A and B quasi-therapists to schizoid and neurotic communications. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 279-286.

Berzins, Juris I., Seidman, Edward, and Welch, Robert D. A-B therapist "types" and responses to patient-communicated hostility. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34 (1), 27-32.

Bohn, Martin J., Jr. Counselor behavior as a function of counselor dominance, counselor experience and client type. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12 (4), 346-352.

Bohn, Martin J., Jr. Therapist responses to hostility and dependency as a function of training. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31 (2), 195-198.

Boneau, Alan C. The effects of violations of assumptions underlying the t test. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57 (1), 49-64.

Campbell, R. E. Counselor personality and background and his interview subrole behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9 (4), 329-334.

Caracena, Philip F. Elicitation of dependency expressions in the initial stage of psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 268-274.

Carson, Robert C., Harden, Judith A., and Shows, W. Derek. A-B distinction and behavior in quasi-therapeutic situations. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 426-433.

Danskin, David G. Roles played by counselors in their interviews. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 22-27.

Frank, George H. and Sweetland, Anders. A study of the process of psychotherapy: The verbal interaction. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 135-138.

Gamsky, Neal R. The effect of client demeanor and focus of hostility upon the responses of school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1968. Order No. 65-9236.

Gamsky, Neal R. and Farwell, Gail F. Counselor verbal behavior as a function of client hostility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 184-190.

Heller, Kenneth. Experimental analogues of psychotherapy: The clinical relevance of laboratory findings on social influence. Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 1963, 137, 420-426.

Heller, Kenneth, Myers, Roger A. and Kline, Linda V. Interviewer behavior as a function of standardized client roles. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 117-122.

Hoffman, A. E. An analysis of counselor subroles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 61-67.

Howard, Kenneth I., Orlinsky, David E., and Hill, James A. The therapist's feelings in the therapeutic process. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25 (1), 83-93.

Kopplin, David A. Eliciting responses in client-therapist interaction: A content analysis of initial psychotherapeutic interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Michigan State University, 1965. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1966. Order No. 66-6142.

Leary, Timothy. Interpersonal diagnosis of personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1957.

Moos, Rudolf and Clemes, Stanley R. Multivariate study of patient-therapist system. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31 (2), 119-130.

Myers, Roger A., Heller, Kenneth, Logue, Patrick E. and Paddock, Jere D. Personality correlates of evoked interviewer behavior. Unpublished manuscript, 1962.

Newcomb, Theodore M., Turner, Ralph H. and Converse, Philip E. Social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Pool, Ithiel de Sola. Trends in content analysis today: A summary. In Ithiel de Sola Pool (Ed.), Trends in content analysis. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1959.

Porter, Elias H., Jr. The development and evaluation of a measure of counseling interview procedures. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1943, 3, 105-126.

Rogers, Carl R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Rommetveit, R. Social norms and roles: Explorations in the psychology of enduring pressures. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.

Russell, Peter D. Counselor anxiety in relation to clinical experience and hostile or friendly clients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961.

Russell, Peter D. and Snyder, William U. Counselor anxiety in relation to amount of clinical experience and quality of affect demonstrated by clients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 22, 358-363.

Schuldt, W. John. Psychotherapists' approach-avoidance responses and clients' expression of dependency. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13 (2), 178-183. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1965. Order No. 65-2065.

Snyder, William U. An investigation of the nature of non-directive psychotherapy. Journal of General Psychology, 1945, 33, 193-223.

Snyder, William U. Dependency and psychotherapy. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Steiber, Judith K. Counselor anxiety and interview behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1968. Order No. 67-12, 279.

Tomczyk, John R. Client perceptions of counselor verbal roles as related to diagnostic category. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Truax, Charles B. and Carkhuff, Robert R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Warkentin, John and Leland, Tom. Human character traits. American Academy of Psychotherapists Tape Library, Volume #4.

Winder, C. L., Ahmad, Farrukh, Bandura, Albert, and Rau, Lucy C. Dependency of patients, psychotherapists' responses, and aspects of psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 129-134.

APPENDIX A

Bales Interaction Process Analysis Categories

Category No.	Interaction Process Analysis Definition
1	Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward.
2	Shows tension release, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction.
3	Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies.
4	Gives suggestion, direction, implying autonomy for other.
5	Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish.
6	Gives orientation, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms.
7	Asks for orientation, information, repetition, confirmation.
8	Asks for opinion, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling.
9	Asks for suggestion, direction, possible ways of action.
10	Disagrees, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help.
11	Shows tension, asks for help, withdraws out of field.
12	Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self.

APPENDIX B

Rating Form for Counselor Behavior Categories

Rater _____ Counselor No. _____

Client _____ Footage: Start ____ End ____

Counselor Behavior Categories

Category	Response Frequency
1. Gives reassurance	_____
2. Shows approval	_____
3. Shows tension release	_____
4. Agrees, understands	_____
5. Gives suggestion	_____
6. Gives interpretation	_____
7. Reflects	_____
8. Gives information	_____
9. Asks for information	_____
10. Asks for elaboration	_____
11. Disagrees, misunderstands	_____
12. Avoids, shows tension	_____
13. Shows disapproval	_____
14. Shows antagonism	_____

Instructions to Raters

In scoring the interview segment, code each counselor response according to the Counselor Behavior Analysis categories

listed below. The response unit to be scored is the smallest discriminable segment of verbal behavior to which you can assign a classification using the given categories. Every response must be assigned to a category, but no response may be assigned to more than one category. The smallest possible context is to be used in assigning a response to a category. That is, a single response should be viewed as an isolated unit rather than within the general context of the interview. Each response should be scored on "face value" rather than imputing "hidden" meaning to it. Finally, in situations involving classification dilemmas, the rater should favor the category more distant from the middle.

Explanation of Behavior Categories

1. Gives reassurance.--The counselor attempts to restore client's confidence or self-esteem. Includes: promises or guarantees that things will turn out all right; attempts to dispel fear, suspicion, anxiety, depression, uncertainty, etc. by creating a feeling of security; efforts to praise, comfort, reassure, or support the client.

   Examples:

   "I'm sure everything will turn out OK."
   "You'll be able to find the answer."
   "I know you'll get the information."
   "I'm confident you'll make the right decision."
   "Believe me, there's no reason to be suspicious."
   "You've thought it through carefully."
   "No one's trying to trick you."
   "I understand how you must feel."

2. Shows approval.--The counselor expresses explicit approval of the client's remarks, behavior or feelings. Includes: approval of something the client has said or done; indications that the counselor considers specific remarks or actions of the client as good, satisfactory, or appropriate; confirmation of the client's course of action.

   Examples:

   "Good." "That's fine." "That's a good point."
   "You've made the right decision."
   (Note: At times it may be difficult to decide whether a remark such as, "You're on the right track" should be scored in category 1 or category 2. If the counselor seems to be using it to reassure or comfort the client, it should be scored in category 1. If, however, he seems to be simply indicating that, in his opinion, the client's remarks, feelings, or behavior are correct or "right," it should be scored in category 2. The latter category is used when the counselor's response

evaluates the client's remarks, feelings, or behavior in such a way as to indicate the counselor approves of them.)

3. Shows tension release.--The couselor attempts to relieve tension by laughing, chuckling, or joking. (Note that a response should be scored in this category only if there is an element of pleasure or satisfaction with the client. If the response contains sarcasm, cynicism, aggression, etc., it should be scored in category 12.)

4. Shows agreement, understanding.--The counselor indicates simple agreement, understanding, or acceptance of client's remarks (includes passive acceptance--short silence).

   Examples:

   "Uh huh." "M--hm." "I see." "I understand." "Yes." "You're right." "That's true." (Note that in this category the counselor's response is simply agreement or understanding of what the client is saying. If the counselor indicates he approves of the client's remarks, it should be scored in category 2. Also, depending on the counselor's tone of voice, comments such as "um hm" may mean approval, disagreement, criticism, etc.)

5. Gives suggestions.--The counselor proposes a course of action or "structures" the interview. Includes: All responses that suggest ways of attaining a desired goal by attacking or modifying the outer situation, or by adapting to it; proposing a solution; suggesting where to start, what to do, how to cope with the problem; advice; attempts to guide the client; persuading or urging some activity; relating experiences of the counselor as examples for the client to follow.

6. Gives interpretation.--The counselor states something that can be inferred from what the client has said or done, but which the client has not specifically mentioned. Includes: all attempts at interpreting, analyzing, inferring, reasoning, musing; expressing an opinion; attempts to understand, diagnose, or interpret what the client is saying. (Note responses in this category are distinguished from those in category 7 in that the counselor is making an inference or interpretation rather than restating or reflecting specific remarks of the client. Category 6 also includes tentative analysis. That is, the counselor presents a new approach to the problem being discussed, but leaves the client

free to reject, accept, or modify the idea. This is typically used after the client lists several factors he sees in a situation, and the counselor, thinking of another possible aspect, asks the client if he has thought of it.)

7. Reflects.--The counselor repeats, restates, clarifies client's remarks. Includes: all attempts to encourage the flow of communication by explaining, summarizing, or clarifying client's remarks; indicating understanding what client has said by repeating or restating client's remarks; rephrasing or clarifying feeling expressed by client; expressions of the counselor's own thought or feelings.

8. Gives information.--The counselor supplies the client with factual information.
Examples:
"You need 10 credits." "The field is listed in the DOT." "You can get the book at the library."
(Note: Be careful not to confuse this category with No. 5. If the counselor is suggesting a course of action, the response should be scored in category 5.)

9. Asks for information.--The counselor asks factual questions. Includes all requests for information that generally require a factual answer. (Note: this category differs from No. 10 in that the counselor states the question in such a way that the client generally must give a factual answer, whereas in category 10 the counselor asks for further elaboration or detailing of the client's remarks.)

10. Asks for elaboration.--The counselor asks for further elaboration of client's remarks or feelings. Includes: open-ended questions or general "leads"; questions designed to encourage the client to explain further or to delve more deeply into the problem; requests for elaboration of how the client feels.
Examples:
"How do you feel about it?"
"What do they think about it?"
"Could you explain that further?"
"Tell me more about it."
"Is there anything else you want to discuss?"

11. Disagrees, misunderstands.--The counselor indicates disagreement or lack of understanding of client's remarks.
Examples:
"No." "You're wrong." "That's incorrect." "I don't understand." "What?"
(Note: A distinction should be made between categories 10 and 11 in regard to lack of understanding. If the

counselor's response is designed to "draw out" the client further, it should be scored in category 10. If the counselor merely asks the client to repeat what he has said (asks for confirmation, expresses uncertainty or lack of understanding) or misunderstands what the client is saying, it should be scored in category 11. The distinction lies in the counselor's attempting to get the client to explore the topic further on the one hand and on the other, the counselor simply wants to clarify what the client has already stated. If the counselor mislabels obvious feelings, it should be scored in category 13.)

12. Avoids, shows tension.--The counselor shows tension, uncertainty, insecurity by retreating or withdrawing from obvious feelings.
Tension includes: indications that the counselor is nervous, tense, insecure, startled, dismayed, perturbed, worried, concerned, apprehensive, fearful, embarrassed, flustered, sheepish; hesitation, blocking, stuttering in speech; admission of lack of training, experience, or knowledge; is apologetic, contrite, self-critical, self-reproachful, self-degrading; blames others for lack of knowledge or inadequacy; shifts responsibility to others; asks client for forbearance, understanding; acts hurt or injured; tells of misfortune, fate, failure of others, hardship with intention of arousing client's sympathy; is despairing, helpless, self-pitying; withdraws by appearing bored, tired; indicates client should leave (not overtly rejecting, otherwise score in category 14); indications that the counselor is dissatisfied.
Avoids includes: ignoring requests for help, complaints, or strong feelings by evasion, equivocation, hedging, changing the subject; attempts to thwart, frustrate, or divert the client's feelings; changes discussion from expression of feelings to a topical level; responds to content of remarks, but ignores obvious feelings; mislabels obvious feelings client expresses; long silences; is cold, distant, detached, indifferent, aloof, formal, unsocial, reserved, unapproachable, dubious, cautious, hesitant.

13. Disapproves.--The counselor indicates that he disapproves of of the client's remarks, feelings, or behavior. Includes: disapproval of something the client has said or done; indication that he regards something the client has said or done as bad, unsatisfactory or inappropriate; objections to or rejection of the client's suggestions; skeptical or dubious about client's actions or proposals. (Note: This category includes disapproval only if very mild and in reference to the client's statements rather than values, feelings, attitudes. If it seems that the counselor disapproves of the client as a person, it should be scored in category 14.)

14. Shows antagonism.--Counselor is aggressive, antagonistic, sarcastic, cynical, defensive, rejecting. Includes: attempts to override the client in speaking; interfering with client's speaking; finishing remarks for him; insisting on finishing his statements; warding off interruption by client; implications of inferiority or incompetence of client; contemptuous, belittling, depreciating, discourteous remarks, trying to minimize feelings; laughing at client; blaming, browbeating, deriding, dominating, subduing, coercing, commanding, directing, badgering, harrassing client; being overbearing, dogmatic, assertive, inconsiderate, negativistic; shocked, appalled, offended, insulted, affronted, irate, pompous, self-righteous; defending self against assault, criticism, blame; implying client has no freedom of choice or action.

APPENDIX C

SCORING MANUAL

Introduction

The context for scoring counselor and client responses will be each pair of verbalizations in which the client talks and the counselor responds.

The precise unit which will be scored for the Counselor will be each sentence within his total verbalization following the client's remarks. Each counselor speech will be numbered; the preceding client speech will be given the same number on the typescript. Thus you give a classification to each sentence in the counselor speech, using as context just this verbalization plus that of the client which just precedes it.

The client coding is more global, i.e., involves an overall rating of the client's entire verbalization rather than of each sentence. Code those client verbalizations which seem clearly aggressive or hostile (e.g., critical, sarcastic) toward one or more particular individuals as AGGR., and then record the name of the person who is the "object" of the aggressive response. Similarly, record "SUBM." when a client response is quite clearly dependent or submissive toward one or more particular individuals and write the type of "object-person" next to it.

When a client response is lengthy, emphasize the last sentence or two in the verbalization when trying to arrive at an evaluation and coding of it. Make a judgment concerning how the person listening would hear the client remark, i.e., as aggressive, critical and sarcastic, or dependent-submissive, or rather neutral.

Categories and Codes for Counselor Verbal Behavior

1. Reassurance (RS)
2. Approval (APP)
3. Tension Release (Tens.Rel.)
4. Suggestion (SUGG)
5. Persuasion (PS)
6. Structuring (STRUCT)
7. Opinion (OPIN)
11. Nondirective Lead (ND)
12. Expression of Tension (Expr.Tens.)
13. Misunderstanding (MIS)
14. Avoidance (AVOID)
15. Disagreement/Disapproval (DIS)
16. Antagonism (ANTAG)
17. Simple Acceptance (SA)

8. Information (INFO)
9. Request for Information (RI)
10. Request for Elaboration (RE)
18. Reflection (REFL)
19. Interpretation (INTERP)
20. Silence (SIL)
21. Unclassifiable (UNCL.)

1. REASSURANCE (RS)

Definition: Counselor tries to restore client's confidence and self-esteem. Includes promises that things will turn out well; minimization of client's problem; assurance that what is true of the client is common and normal; efforts to comfort and support the client, by creating a feeling of security. Statements which imply sympathy.

Examples: CLIENT: "I was hoping this is the right place to talk over my problem."
COUNS.: "Fine. You know, this problem isn't unique with you, I'm sure."

CLIENT: "I want to talk things over."
COUNS.: "Yes, it'll get them off your chest."

2. APPROVAL (APP)

Definition: Counselor gives explicit approval of client's remarks, behavior or feelings. Confirmation of client's course of action or idea; indications that the counselor considers specific remarks or actions by the client as good.

Examples: CLIENT: "I suppose if you knew the material and liked it, you should be pretty successful at it."
COUNS.: "That would seem to me pretty logical."

COUNS.: "I don't smoke, but you are certainly welcome to."

COUNS.: "Go right ahead."

3. TENSION RELEASE (TENS. REL.)

Definition: Making joke or small talk between counselor himself and the client to make them feel at ease. (Note: Be sure it's not a tense or inappropriate laugh which should be scored "Expression of Tension.") Directly meeting a client need or being frank, in order to get beyond tension.

Examples: COUNS.: "Oh, no thanks, I'm smoking too much."

(Client looking for matches)
COUNS.: "Here you are; here's some matches."

4. SUGGESTION (SUGG)

Definition: Counselor attempts to advise or propose a course of action; attempts to imply that the client should have a certain viewpoint, attitude, or action, or change from what he is now doing. All responses which suggest ways of attaining a desired goal, propose solutions, suggest what to do, where to start, how to cope -- in session or other situations. Includes counselor giving own experiences as examples for client to follow.

Examples: COUNS.: "Have you tried speaking with your professors?"

COUNS.: "A summer job might give you the experience you feel you need."

5. PERSUASION (PS)

Definition: Quite strong statements in which the counselor is trying to suggest a point of view or course of action. If counselor is repetitive about a suggestion, code the second, etc. repetitions "PS" if it seems that the counselor is using this response to push his point harder.

Examples: COUNS.:("You say that you have no problem.) Yet you're thinking of transferring to another school away from here."

COUNS.: "That would make you feel better, but your problem would still be there, wouldn't it?"

6. STRUCTURING (STRUCT)

Definition: Remarks which define the counseling situation; stating what is appropriate to do or expect in counseling, purposes of the interview; setting time and limits of the interview.

Examples: COUNS.: "This is your period to talk and tell what you think."

COUNS.: "That's one thing, uh, here we don't take sides between you and your teachers."

7. OPINION (OPIN)

Definition: Counselor states his viewpoint. Differs from "Interpretation" and "Gives information" in that it (1) is not about client's behavior or responses; (2) is more personal or non-factual than what would be considered "information." Includes all remarks by counselor in which he tells about himself or what he is doing.

Examples: CLIENT: "I want to feel I know what I'm doing when I decide."
COUNS.: "Well, I don't think you can know everything before you have to make the decision, most of the time, anyway."

COUNS.: "If you go on to school, that means you can put off the decision about a job for much longer, as I see it."

8. INFORMATION (INFO)

Definition: Counselor states factual information or explains what he means, tells client what he has just said to help client understand it better, when client indicates he does not understand and asks for clarification.

Examples: COUNS.: " x x x x x."
CLIENT: What do you mean?"
COUNS.: "You were talking about wanting to have students bring up their own ideas."

COUNS.: "I can put you on Dr. M--'s waiting list -- as you know, it's quite long."

9. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RI)

Definition: Counselor asks client more or less factual questions; initiates discussion of a topic, as opposed to "drawing the client out" to speak further on the same topic. Not necessarily in question format, it may be "Tell me about X."

10. REQUEST FOR ELABORATION (RE)

Definition: The counselor asks for further elaboration of the client's remarks or feelings. Includes open-ended questions or general "lead" questions designed to encourage the client to explain further or to delve more deeply into the problem; requests for elaboration of how the client feels.

Examples: COUNS.: "Is there anything else you'd like to discuss?"

COUNS.: "It seems you feel this is some decision that you're being--going to have to make, and you're wondering if you're capable of making it. I mean, is that how you're feeling?"

11. NONDIRECTIVE LEAD (ND)

Definition: The counselor attempts to encourage the client to elaborate his statements or feelings further, without narrowing the topic, and in a tone which indicates that the client is free to accept the suggestion or not.

Examples: COUNS.: "Would you care to explain more?"

CLIENT: "I've been feeling very anxious."
COUNS.: "Anxious?"

12. EXPRESSION OF TENSION (EXPR. OF TENS.)

Definition: Indications that the counselor is nervous, insecure, embarrassed, flustered; apologetic, self-degrading; asks client for forbearance or understanding; withdraws by appearing bored or tired; hesitates, blocks, stutters in speech making a notably incomplete sentence.

Examples: COUNS.: "These fellows could sort of - uh... Well, you said that you..."

CLIENT: "Somebody back there behind that one-way mirror?"
COUNS.: "Uh- I don't know, maybe yes, maybe not.. (coughs). (COUGH would be coded as Tension.)

13. MISUNDERSTANDING/MISLABELING (MIS)

Definition: The counselor indicates lack of understanding of client's preceding remarks, by saying so, or by making a response which is quite clearly a misinterpretation of what the client said.

Example: CLIENT: "I live with a couple of guys -- I hardly pay attention to what they're doing."

COUNS.: "You're living with a nice bunch of fellas then, huh?"

14. AVOIDANCE (AVOID.)

Definition: The counselor ignores requests for help, complaints, or strong feelings by evasion, hedging, changing the subject, asking a factual question which does not respond to the client's feelings; attempts to divert or frustrate the client's expression of feelings; cold, distant, aloof, formal, cautious, dubious; ignores feelings; changes topics.

Examples: CLIENT: "I desperately need help. Won't you help me?"
COUNS.: "Well, uh, I think if we explore this a little bit more..."

COUNS.: "Well, I would like to help, but, uh, - I'm not too sure my experience would be the same as yours."

15. DISAGREEMENT/DISAPPROVAL (DIS)

Definition: The counselor indicates that he disapproves of the client's remarks, feelings, or behavior. Includes disapproval of something the client has said or done; indication that he regards something the client has said or done as inappropriate, unsatisfactory or mistaken; skeptical or dubious about the client's statements, actions, or proposals.

Examples: CLIENT: "I really hope we can come to some decision here."
COUNS.: "It really would be too much to expect to do that."

COUNS.: "You think it will solve the whole situation to come down here, huh?"

16. ANTAGONISM (ANTAG)

Definition: Counselor is aggressive, sarcastic, defensive or rejecting. Includes attempts to override the client in speaking; implications of inferiority or incompetence in the client; belittling, depreciating, contemptuous; blaming, deriding, browbeating, dominating and badgering the client; being overbearing, dogmatic, inconsiderate, negativistic, self-righteous.

Example: CLIENT: "I really don't have any problem bothering me."
COUNS.: "Well, you want to just sit here for the rest of the interview?"

17. SIMPLE ACCEPTANCE (S.A.)

Definition: Simple expression of understanding and acceptance of what the client has said. If approval is strongly implied, this would be Reassurance or Approval.

Examples: COUNS.: "I see."
COUNS.: "Mm-hmm..."

18. REFLECTION (REFL)

Definition: Include in this category only counselor statements making very close rephrasing or restatement of what the client said.
Statements of "You mentioned X,...." are to be considered Interpretations, not reflections, since they involve active selection by the counselor of something the client had talked of earlier which the counselor wishes to focus on.
Include within "reflection" finishing the client's sentence when the counselor seems to be accurate in following what the client is trying to express.
Include restatement or clarification of client's feelings when the counselor makes a very close rephrasing of those feelings.

Examples: CLIENT: "Time is going, and I just have to decide."
COUNS.: "You feel there isn't much time, and you feel pressured to make the decision."

CLIENT: "I don't know what I'm going to do when I get through this year, my senior year. I can't make up my mind."
COUNS.: "You're worried, you can't make up your mind."

19. INTERPRETATION (INTERP)

Definition: The counselor states something which can be inferred from what the client has said or done, but which the client has not specifically said or done. Includes all attempts at analyzing, inferring, reasoning, musing about the client, what he has said or his actions; attempts to diagnose, understand or analyze the client's responses.

Examples: CLIENT: "I couldn't tell you who my childhood friends were."
COUNS.: "You don't recall too much about your early life."

CLIENT: "Lousy teacher - well, that's it."
COUNS.: "And this just began recently, no trouble before."

20. SILENCE (SIL)

Definition: Each ten-second period of silence on the part of the counselor is coded as another Silence response. When you hear silence on the tape, pick up a watch with a second hand and start noting the number of ten second units which intervene before the next words are spoken.
The number of silence units in a counselor verbalization may vary from none, to one, to any number.

21. UNCLASSIFIABLE (UNCL.)

Definition: Include any sentence or expression verbalized by the counselor which can not be classified in any of the above verbal behavior categories. If possible, however, use one of the preceding classifications.

APPENDIX D

Comparison of Bales, Gamsky and Greene Counselor Behavior Categories

	BALES	GAMSKY	GREENE
1.	Shows solidarity	Gives reassurance	Reassurance
2.	(Agrees)	Shows approval	Approval
3.	Shows tension release	Shows tension release	Tension release
4.	Gives suggestion	Gives suggestion	Suggestion
5.			Persuasion
6.			Structuring
7.			Opinion
8.	Gives orientation	Gives information	Information
9.	Asks for opinion	Gives interpretation	Interpretation
10.	Asks for orientation Asks for suggestion	Asks for information	Request for information
11.		Asks for elaboration	Request for elaboration
12.		Reflection	Reflection
13.			Nondirective lead
14.	(Agrees)	Agrees, understands	Simple acceptance
15.			Silence
16.		Avoids, shows tension	Avoidance
17.	Shows tension		Expression of tension
18.	Disagrees	Disagrees, disapproval, misunderstands	Disagreement, disapproval
19.			Misunderstanding
20.	Shows antagonism	Shows antagonism	Antagonism

PAGE 1
Int.# S-1
Date
Rater EFG

APPENDIX B

TABULATION SHEET - Coding of Counselor/Client Responses

R-#	CLIENT R's	OBJECT of Client R's	R-#	COUNSELOR RESPONSES
1 26			1 26	
2 27			2 27	
3 28			3 28	
4 29			4 29	
5 30			5 30	
6 31			6 31	
7 32			7 32	
8 33			8 33	
9 34			9 34	
10 35			10 35	
11 36			11 36	
12 37			12 37	
13 38			13 38	
14 39			14 39	
15 40			15 40	
16 41		(Beg.of Min.#6)	16 41	Refl
17 42			17 42	Interp
18 43			18 43	Refl
19 44	Asks Info	Couns.	19 44	Info
20 45			20 45	SA
21 46			21 46	Interp
22 47	Aggr	Couns.	22 47	ETens/Interp/Interp/ETens
23 48			23 48	Sil/Sil
24 49			24 49	ETens/Info/ETens/ETens
25 50	Aggr	Couns.	25 50	Info